

A  
'71  
A 416

THE RESISTANCE: A CHRISTIAN OPTION  
"

---

A Dissertation  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the  
School of Theology at Claremont

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Religion

---

by  
Lambert Willis All  
" "  
June 1971

PERMISSION TO COPY  
BY \_\_\_\_\_  
FROM \_\_\_\_\_

*This dissertation, written by*

Lambert Willis All

*under the direction of— his Faculty Committee,  
and approved by its members, has been presented  
to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of  
Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of*

**DOCTOR OF RELIGION**

*Faculty Committee*

Don D. Rhodes  
Loren R. Linder

*Date*

June 1971

F. Murray Trotter

## PREFACE

I want to express my indebtedness to several people who helped me in preparation of this dissertation. Thanks go to Dr. Dan Rhoades who served as chairman of my committee and offered innumerable suggestions. I also wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Loren Fisher for his constructive criticisms. Both of these men helped me to clarify my statements. Above all I acknowledge with gratitude the men of conscience in the resistance movement that have confronted me with my own position.

Thanks also go to the members of Murrieta United Methodist Church who allowed me the time to write this. I also want to acknowledge the help of Mrs. Liz Pasco, Mrs. Virginia House and Miss Pam Melnar for helping type the rough draft. Great appreciation is extended to Mrs. Mary Hightower for typing the final copy.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
The Purpose of the Study . . . . .	1
Justification of the Problem . . . . .	2
Methodology . . . . .	7
II. SOURCES OF AUTHORITY . . . . .	16
Scriptural Base . . . . .	16
The New Testament and the state . . . . .	16
The Kingdom of God and eschatology . . . . .	24
Church Tradition . . . . .	27
Historical aspects of the just-war . . . . .	28
Vietnam and the just-war theory . . . . .	33
Personal Moral Judgment . . . . .	37
The meaning of conscience . . . . .	37
The decision to disobey . . . . .	42
III. A THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATION FOR A CONTEMPORARY STATEMENT	
ABOUT THE RESISTANCE . . . . .	46
God's Action in History . . . . .	47
Open to the world . . . . .	48
The problem of self-interest . . . . .	50
The problem of unity and national interest . . . . .	53
Human activity . . . . .	58
The Theology of Hope . . . . .	64
Identity . . . . .	65

CHAPTER	PAGE
To transform . . . . .	69
The future possibility . . . . .	70
Individual involvement . . . . .	76
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE RESISTANCE MOVEMENT AND ITS CONTEMPORARY	
THRUST . . . . .	82
What is Happening and Why . . . . .	82
Destruction of draft cards . . . . .	90
Destroying draft files in mass . . . . .	92
Emigration and exile . . . . .	94
Refusal of induction and prison . . . . .	96
Reform within the military . . . . .	98
Other aspects . . . . .	100
Conclusions to be Drawn . . . . .	101
The Role of the Church . . . . .	105
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	114
APPENDIX A. The Catonsville Statement . . . . .	121
APPENDIX B. The Milwaukee Statement . . . . .	124
APPENDIX C. I Chose Canada . . . . .	127
APPENDIX D. A Letter of Non-Cooperation . . . . .	129
APPENDIX E. Concerned Officers Movement . . . . .	131

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### I. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to present a discussion about the present resistance movement in America. There has been tremendous unrest among many people in our country, both civilian and military, young and old, because of United States involvement in Vietnam and Southeast Asia. The resistance movement has grown quite large and is having a significant impact on our society. It is calling into question the legitimacy of the authority of the State over the conscience of the individual. The resister is saying no to the State and is responding to what he would call a higher calling that is forcing him to say no to illegitimate authority. The questions surrounding our involvement in Southeast Asia are causing disruption to the fabric of our society.

This study is an attempt to raise some issues related to the resistance movement and discuss the implications of it to the Christian conscience. Basic to the study is the relation of the Christian to the authority of the State. Indeed how is the Christian of good conscience to respond to the State when it places a demand on his life that he perceives to be opposed to the conscience that his faith dictates to him?

The political situation in our society today is unquestionably complex. Easy answers to our perplexities are simply not available.

The problem of the war in Vietnam is a prime example. How does the average citizen begin to assess a situation of this type? How does a sensitive Christian apply a process of ethics to the problem of extricating his country from a deep involvement in evil. There is a real difficulty in trying to find appropriate methodologies in bringing about a significant change in our social system.

## II. JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

A study of the resistance is justified because so little has been done with it. It is an extremely important historical event. There has been significant material published about the different aspects of the resistance. However, little has been done dealing with the ethical aspects or its theological significance. It is for this reason that the study was undertaken.

A book that has been most effective in raising some of the basic problems of war is Ralph B. Potter's, War and Moral Discourse.<sup>1</sup> He attempts to tackle some of the underlying problems and assumptions. He speaks of the general problem of international war. He is concerned with the problem of reflecting on the issues of war and peace. How do we talk about them and evaluate their implications?

According to Potter, there are four basic elements at work in arriving at a political policy. These are: (1) analysis of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ralph B. Potter, War and Moral Discourse (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1969)

situation, (2) a center of loyalty, (3) a mode of ethical reasoning, and (4) a theological system. Any political policy on war would include assumptions regarding these four elements. Indeed, changing any one assumption might well change the resultant policy decision. For instance, one's theological beliefs, his mode of ethical reasoning and his center of loyalty might remain stable, but if his understanding of a situation changes, he is apt to restructure his stand. Likewise one's understanding of the situation, his theological beliefs, and his center of loyalty might remain constant, but if his mode of ethical reasoning changes, he might subsequently alter his decision. I will attempt in this dissertation to deal with these four underlying assumptions as they relate to the problem of the resistance.

There are some important implications in considering these basic elements. First, there is no non-moral or non-ethical view of political affairs. The question "why" must always be asked of specific policy and must take account of ethical assumptions. The Christian is called to remain sensitive to these ethical assumptions and may need to call them into question.

On the other hand, there is no "purely moral view" of policy either. Such a realization might well deter concerned Christians from pietism and moralism when dealing with issues as complex as war and international relations. Prophetic judgments are indeed part of what is needed. However there is a decisive problem when it comes to making prophetic judgments regarding ends and means. The ends are obvious but the means of obtaining these ends are certainly open to



question. The answer to this question involves one in other types of consideration beyond morality and religion.

Perhaps the most important implication of Potter's analysis is that these four elements are inter-related. Therefore to effectively influence policy decisions and change public opinion one has only to significantly alter one segment of the system. Such considerations are extremely important for those who are actively engaged in the struggle of the resistance. For instance, if the method of protest is active demonstration, then the strategy of the demonstrator should be to alter specific assumptions that people have in relation to the war in Vietnam. This should be done rather than simply appealing for justice and peace. If he chose to alter the perception of the situation, his approach might be to deal with: the problem of the military-industrial complex; the control the Pentagon has over foreign policy; the number of people involved in the resistance and its various aspects; or the prejudicial attitude that permeates the Selective Service System. If on the other hand he wanted to alter the mode of ethical reasoning, his approach might be to raise issues such as: the indiscriminate killing of innocent civilians; the authority of the State over the individual conscience; the need for re-evaluation of domestic and foreign priorities; or a discussion of the problem of narrow self-interests of individuals and nations.

Whatever the choice, one should be very self-conscious about the manner in which he has arrived at it. First, do the principles underlying the argument stand the test of generalizability? We are often tempted to determine our response to specific issues without

considering a wider perspective. We must ask if all men would use these same principles? If there were another situation comparable to Vietnam would we apply the same set of generalizations?

A second consideration is consistency. The example Potter uses is the inconsistency in the mode of ethical reasoning used to deal with sexual standards on the one hand, and the student revolution against the war on the other. In the area of sex, students value autonomy and independence from societal norms. In the area of war and international relations however, students proclaim moral imperatives which should bind all of American society. Again it is apparent that the principles that define a position must be clearly thought out and spelled out if our protests are to gain their objective of altering public opinion and changing foreign policy.

A third consideration is the principle of proportionality between ends and means. The method of demonstration or protest should not detract from the intent of the demonstrators. This is particularly true because of the polarization of our society. At the point where violence reaches a certain threshold, the demonstration itself becomes the prime issue in the minds of its adversaries and the issues which prompted the demonstration are lost. This point is particularly important with our discussion about the resistance. This is true for two reasons. First, many people expect violence to become a part of any and all demonstrations. Second is the use of violence against materialism of Selective Service files. The distinction must be made between violence to people and violence that arises from the destruction of material goods. I refer particularly to the destruction of

draft files that has taken place. I would submit that this fear is motivated by a misunderstanding of the situation, but that makes little difference in the mind of the beholder. The problem comes back to the age old question of getting the observer to ask why, rather than to simply look at the situation in utter horror when he sees violence overtly displayed. This means that if too much emotional energy is spent reacting to the demonstrators, little is left for rationally considering the issues and positions related to war and peace.

The principle of proportionality between ends and means is an example of the interrelationship between ethical and factual considerations. Many times people affirm general ethical principles without understanding their more specific practical application. An example of this is the way many liberals participate in a protest demonstration. The accusation is made against them that they may be interested in the Vietnam war, but they also participate by working for a company that gains most of its revenue from the military-industry complex. They do nothing about trying to change the company. Such a criticism points out how people are interested in a specific issue but are unable to relate it in a general way to their own personal life.

We are in a position of history when we must transcend mere displays of emotion in relating to these issues. Political strategies must relate to the real issues and not just express emotions. We must go beyond simply reacting in opposition to those who have a different understanding. We need to recapture perspective and delve to uncover presuppositions. By doing this, it might enable many Americans to move from polarization and begin to seek a rational response to the

problem. If we could begin to move in this direction, I believe we could effectively change American public opinion.

This points out the reasons for the importance of a study of the underlying assumptions of the problem of the resistance. Many of the underlying causes of the problems that the resistance meets are rooted to the fact that it touches the lives of the average citizen in so many different ways. The examples of this are numerous. He may work in a job related to the military-industrial complex. He is paying taxes that are being used to support the war. Parents and relatives are confronted about deciding what to do when their son or someone they know decides to refuse to cooperate with Selective Service.

### III. METHODOLOGY

We will begin with a discussion of the Christian principles which provide the basis for our understanding of the resistance. The three main sources that we propose to use are Scripture, church tradition and finally individual conscience.

We must start with a discussion about the resistance and its implications for ethical conduct. One must first realize and understand the basis of his action. Many accusations have been made about Christians for their inability to act out their life in accordance with the basic tenants of the Christian faith. Gordon Zahn points this out clearly in the following statement:

We have forgotten that the price of being a Christian was never intended to be an easy price; that, on the contrary, the closer one gets to the Cross, the closer he gets to the ideal--and the likelihood of actual martyrdom. Self-sacrificing love of God and neighbor seems to have lost its place as the first and greatest command-

ment to the more practical and all-justifying 'law of self-preservation.' At the same time, political freedom has moved so far up the scale of ultimate values that it is almost in bad taste to refer to the fact that Christ Himself was a member of an occupied nation and the Caesar whose image was on the coin was a foreign oppressor.<sup>2</sup>

Christian ethics then must begin with the primary challenge of its own theological base and competence. Its origin must begin with an understanding of the activity of man in light of the God that is distinctive to the Judeo-Christian tradition.

When we consider man's action, we realize the inadequacy of what he does. Sellers outlines three aspects of man's inadequacy. First of all, Sellers says, man is finite. "Human actions are judged by surrounding human action and by further, later human action."<sup>3</sup> There can be no real ultimacy in any act that man does. It must be seen in light of everything else that is taking place. Human conduct has many varied forms of involvement. Some Christians do one thing out of a deep commitment to their faith and side by side with them, there are other Christians doing exactly the opposite. We also note that future actions may also cancel out what we have done in the past. We do not know what the future holds for us and any act that we participate in must be viewed in that light. Therefore the finitude of man prevents him from asserting that what he does has ultimate significance.

---

<sup>2</sup> Gordon C. Zahn, War, Conscience and Dissent (New York: Hawthorn, 1967), p. 47.

<sup>3</sup> James Sellers, Theological Ethics (New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 181.

Second, Sellers states man is an underachiever. He "fails" to measure up to his possibilities.<sup>4</sup> Man is not able to accomplish all that he ought to be about. No matter how hard he may try or how deeply committed he may be to the task of the Christian discipleship he never fully succeeds. There are many tasks and jobs that remain undone. Many times he is not even able to perceive all the possibilities that may be open to him. If we are not exposed to various options and choices we have no way of acting out in response to them. It is often easy for man to give up in the midst of a situation and say it is no use for him to continue. He uses up his energy and begins to slow down and in many cases even gives up the cause completely.

The third aspect of man's inadequacy according to Sellers is because of his fallenness. Sellers states it this way:

Men fall when they deceive themselves that their complacency is initiative, when they pretend that their self-attention is serving the others, when they stake out a narrow corridor of space and claim to be living in a commonwealth. When they focus upon a shallow present and claim to be living in the Kairos.<sup>5</sup>

Many times man thinks he is being creative when he is really doing nothing at all. Man's self-deception usually involves the attempt to justify himself in light of the very principles under which he stands in judgment. This is an indication of his alienation from God since God is the source of the principles. Man becomes alienated because he does not understand God's relationship to the world. We often live in a small moment of history and yet we think that we are living in the

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 183.    <sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 185.

most important time that has ever been. Man is not able to see beyond the confines of his own environment. He lacks an awareness of the eternal perspective. His view of life is distorted by his egocentrism.

With this understanding in mind then, we must ask what basis can be used to evaluate action. What is the source of authority that we can use to evaluate our decisions? Indeed how do we really know what we should do, and how do we know if we are doing the right thing? We must draw from three different sources of authority, the Scripture, the church and the individual conscience.

There is general agreement among Christians about the authority of the Bible. It is this source that forms the basis of our understanding of God's relation to the world and man's place in society. It is the final appeal to decide what the Christian faith teaches and therefore Scripture must be taken very seriously. This is our justification for beginning with the Scripture.

While the Scripture is generally accepted among Christians as a source of authority, the problem here lies in the area of hermeneutics or interpretation. Protestantism has always assumed the Bible to be a medium of revelation and understanding of the will of God. It points to the hope that mankind believes in. It also challenges us to be prophetic in judging society and attempting to reformulate a newer and better vision. It provides us with a perspective and lays out an understanding of the world. It also acts as a guide for human actions. We are to look to the Bible to try to find an understanding of the nature of man and his purpose. We see within the tradition of the Scriptures the possibilities for hope and fulfillment of mankind.

The guidelines for conduct and action must be judged on the basis of its relationship to the tradition of the Scriptures from which it may or may not have been derived. Ethics from a Christian perspective must be dependent on the Biblical sources because it needs to know the basis upon which it stands. The Bible holds the distinctive promise for men in their lives when they live and act according to the view of their faith.

The New Testament points out that the Christian has an obligation to the State. Our problem is in trying to comprehend when the Christian must say no to the State and yes to God. It is only when the Scripture can attest itself to reason, conscience and experience that real belief takes shape. Herein lies the problem of realizing the individual Christian's responsibility to the State. The Scripture allows us to determine the nature and content of the Christian faith and must therefore be used as one of our primary sources of authority. This is because it is only through the Bible that we can know anything tangible about the Gospel.

The church will be viewed as a second source of authority. It has been difficult to realize the significance of the Biblical teachings without the church to help interpret them. As time changes so do our problems. Many aspects of contemporary life could not have been foreseen in Biblical times. It is therefore necessary to view the church as a source of authority in attempting to recognize theological aspects of contemporary life. It is a help in understanding the significance of our Biblical heritage and its relevance to present life.



The church and the individual Christian obviously share many other sources of knowledge in contemporary society. This then means it is not dependent just upon the sources available within the institutional church but must be seen in light of what society is saying. There are many aspects of the wider community of people who are striving to determine the ethical validity of actions. This would include the academic community that strives to raise the basic questions of conduct. We must take note about what the philosophers are telling us. Anthropologists are shedding light on the understanding of man. Sociologists are pointing out implications of social involvement of mankind. The psychologist talks to us about psychological aspects of human behavior. The Christian part of the community points out the light and hope that they see in the understanding of Jesus Christ. They base their understanding of fulfillment in light of what they see as the possibilities of life in view of the act of God in Jesus.

Beyond this we also must grasp the significance of church tradition in relating to the problem of war. The church has set up a foundation for viewing war through the just-war theory. This theory has provided a focal point for viewing how the Christian should understand war. Just-war theory has legitimized war in some cases when certain conditions are present in society. It has pointed out how a war should be initiated; when it should take place; and how it should be fought. We will attempt to review the just-war theory and place it in contemporary perspective by showing how it relates to the present conflict in Southeast Asia.

Our third and final claimant for authority is individual

conscience. Herein lies the crux of our problem when we discuss the resistance. The individual must finally make his own decision for his action in the world. Overall perspectives of human conduct and action can be derived and justified from the view of the Scripture. Ethical pronouncements can be verbalized by the church. But ultimately and finally the individual must make his own conscientious decision about what he plans to do. Christian ethics is seen as deficient if "it treats the theological stance without considering the equivalent of the stance in terms of human temporal action."<sup>6</sup> Each individual must weigh the evidence that is available to him. He must realize his own personal judgment is incomplete in itself. There has been a great deal of fear about leaving moral judgments up to the individual based on his own reflection. We must give a more positive and significant role to the individual and his ability to make these decisions. We need to use autonomy, freedom and personal gifts of judgment in light of Scripture and tradition. We cannot avoid the ingredient of personal autonomy for Christian ethics. We have a drive for personal integrity that drives man to strive for the best he is able to perceive.

While the Christian must assume the individual responsibility for his actions, it is necessary for him to demonstrate that the dictates of his conscience are shaped by his involvement in the Christian community.

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 127.

Through his own process of reasoning out his convictions he makes his conclusions. But he must not act simply out of his own personal convictions and conclusions. He should strive to show the relationship between his conclusions and the Scriptural norms and teachings of the church. This is his specific social context and indicates his recognition that all morality has a social dimension. Individual responsibility is balanced by social accountability.

This discussion of ethical methodology can be best summarized by a concluding paragraph from Sellers' book:

We can round out our analysis by pointing out again that no view of revelation or wisdom for Christian ethics is complete unless it incorporates positive elements from all three sources. Christian ethics begins with a theological stance outlining the basic dimensions of wholeness drawn from Scripture. It finds illustrative and corrective embodiment of that stance in the community as clarified by community ethical judgment. It finds its embodiment further given flesh in the words and deeds of persons as expressed in personal moral judgments. It is in the complementarity and, at times, competition among these media that Christian ethics finds wisdom.<sup>7</sup>

This summary, however, like Potter's previous indication of basic elements, also emphasizes the importance of one's general theological system. In order to indicate our theological basis, we will discuss two contemporary theologians. We will discuss the thinking of Wolfhart Pannenberg and Jürgen Moltmann.

Pannenberg will be used to supply an understanding of God's action in history. Central to this idea is how God continues to act in society. This criterion will be used to state my general context for specific application. The proposal is that wherever a group of

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p.109.

people are acting to create a more just and loving society it is an act of God in the world.

My thesis is that God is indeed acting through the resistance movement, a group of dedicated and concerned citizens who desire to build a better world. This is true even though some resisters would no doubt deny the claim. When the institutional church fails to grasp the significance of its mission in society, God will raise up a remnant to act on his behalf. Our problem is in realizing what constitutes an activity that we can claim to be God's action. My strong suspicion is that when a group acts out of a commitment of love and concern for their fellow man, then they can be seen as part of God's activity. It is my conclusion that the resisters are acting on a deep commitment to build a better world because of a vision of justice and love. They are a self-conscious movement that acts, not out of fear and resentment, but out of a deep conviction for the betterment and freedom of mankind. If a movement is to be viewed as God's activity, then their activity must also fit in the perspective of the Biblical heritage. It is seen as the ongoing action of God.

Moltmann will be used to analyze a theology of hope. Central to this is the idea of promise and fulfillment. God has acted in the past, and Moltmann supplies a foundation that God will continue to act and a better world will emerge. We will attempt to show that because of God's promise of salvation, as revealed through the Scripture, we do have a hope for a greater world. The resistance movement will be seen as part of the process of promise and fulfillment.

## CHAPTER II

### SOURCES OF AUTHORITY

We realize the importance of acknowledging sources of authority in decision making. We will look at these sources of authority. The first is the authority of Scripture. We will discuss the New Testament understanding of the State and the meaning of the Kingdom of God. The second source of authority is church tradition. This will be reviewed by looking at the just-war theory and its relationship to Vietnam. The final source of authority is personal moral judgment. Under this we will discuss the meaning of conscience and the decision to disobey.

#### I. SCRIPTURAL BASE

##### The New Testament and the State

We have stated that the Scripture must be seen as a source of authority. The Christian has an obligation to discover the Biblical implications related to his choices. Let us look at the New Testament understanding of the State. The early Christians in many cases were martyrs because of their opposition to the Roman Government. They felt that their Christian conscience came into conflict with the demands of the State. In many cases this was true because the State was demanding from them exactly what they could not give, mainly their ultimate allegiance. Their ultimate allegiance belonged to God. They could not bow down and worship the State as they were asked to do.

I would like to deal specifically with the passage in Mark 12

about paying taxes to Caesar. Robert Funk in the Second Annual Colwell Lecture at the School of Theology in Claremont discussed the meaning of this text.<sup>1</sup> Funk's position is that Jesus did not intend to set up a series of rules for his followers. Rather Jesus wanted the individual to make up his own mind when he was confronted by this question. Each individual needed to respond to the claim of God on his own life. Jesus did not desire to tell the individual what he must do. The individual must face the problem himself and decide what he feels God wants from him.

This is the only place where the problem of the power of the State is mentioned by Jesus in the New Testament. This presents a problem to us because one of the most burning issues of our day is the relationship of religion to political life. Funk feels that Jesus ducked the issue because of his belief in the approach of God's reign. It may be that Jesus' belief was that God would soon be coming to redeem the world.

Funk feels that the question is loaded. Those who are asking the question are trying to get Jesus to make an affirmation for the proprietary rights of Caesar. Jesus in an ironic way evades the question and avoids falling into the trap set for him. Jesus gives the advise to pay the tax. Jesus' answer informs them to pay the tax, but he does not answer the question. Funk feels that Jesus does this because he is aware of what the questioners are up to. The real

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert Funk, "Magic Beyond Truth" (Paper read at Second Annual Colwell Lecture, Claremont, California, February 11, 1971).

question is not the right of Caesar but the jurisdiction of God. The answer is to the question of what belongs to God. The problem of the State is placed in the margin and not spoken to. Jesus' response is really incommensurable to the question of the claim of God. It allows the auditor to shift the outcome by the way he responds to the question and answer. The reader must write the rest of the answer. Human beings as creatures of imagination take their place in the process. They have their own freedom to respond. Funk feels that Jesus taught to prevent literal interpretation.

According to Funk, Jesus came proclaiming the reign of God but the questioners could not see it. They did not understand the way Jesus saw the world. Jesus realized this and that is perhaps part of the reason he evaded the question.

Cullman views this a little differently. He tries to explain who the Herodians were that asked Jesus the question.<sup>2</sup> The Herodians were a movement that attributed the same value to Caesar as they did to God. Caesar was seen as God's counterpart. Jesus does not say this at all. Jesus does recognize the fact that in its own sphere, the State does have a right to demand what belongs to it. This is particularly well understood in the example of paying taxes to Caesar when Jesus said "Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's and unto God what is God's." Jesus is saying that the State can demand what belongs to it, mainly money and taxes. But it is not placed on the same level as

---

<sup>2</sup>Oscar Cullmann, The State in the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956), p. 35-36

God. Give God what is His, "This means your life, your entire person."<sup>3</sup>

Cullmann feels Jesus' attitude to the State is seen from two opposing attitudes. Jesus does not uncritically absolutize the Roman State. At the same time, Jesus does not advocate any complete political resistance to it. Cullmann sums up Jesus' attitude toward the State this way:

Thus Jesus' whole position toward the State is clearly circumscribed, precisely in the duality it entails throughout. On the one hand, the State is nothing final. On the other, it has the right to demand what is necessary to its existence—but no more. Every totalitarian claim of the State is thereby disallowed. And the double imperative logically follows: on the one hand, do not let the Zealots draw you into a purely political martial action against the existence of the Roman State; on the other, do not give to the State what belongs to God! In the background we hear the challenge: If ever the State demands what belongs to God, if ever it hinders you in the proclamation of the Kingdom of God, then resist it. The whole leitmotiv of the complex New Testament attitude toward the State Jesus formulates here.<sup>4</sup>

Cullmann believes Paul also makes the same claim for the Christian. The Gospel commands the Christian to maintain a critical attitude when he views the State. At the same time, he must give the State what is necessary for it to maintain itself. Paul makes a direct claim for the affirmation of the State as an institution. He does not speak to the problem of a totalitarian State that claims for itself what really belongs to God. Yet there can be no real doubt that Paul would also not have told the Christians to obey the State when it demanded what was rightfully God's.<sup>5</sup> When the State demands absolute

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 36. <sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 37. <sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 64-65.



obedience then I feel that Paul would say the Christian must say no. Only God can demand absolute obedience. When the Christian citizen is told to worship the State by giving it absolute authority then it becomes idolatry. The principles that determine this relate to the provisional nature of the State. One does not give his ultimate allegiance to a provisional State. One realizes the State is not final and the Christian therefore is free to respond in obedience to God rather than the State.

No discussion about Paul's attitude toward the State can pass without mention of Romans 13. It is here that Paul states, "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God." It must be stated that in Romans 13, Paul really means the political authority. Bornkamm feels this means that followers of Christ are also subject to the order that is binding to all men, Jews, Gentiles, Christians and non-Christians.<sup>6</sup> St. Paul thus understands the State as a part of the old aeon and not representing the Kingdom of Christ. Thus the law of the State applies to all men and is seen as setting a direction toward which we all move. St. Paul feels that it is God's will and the State should be obeyed. It is necessary under the present circumstance. The Christian must fulfill what his conscience tells him he owes to the State as he sees it as God's order for him. The obligations to the political life must not be left

---

<sup>6</sup>Gunther Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 24.

incomplete. The Christian is really called to an unending obligation of love. This obligation goes beyond what the old aeon demands of the individual.

Bornkamm says this does not differ from what Jesus was saying about the tax.<sup>7</sup> Man's relationship to the State is given a plain simple clear form. The reason for this is to allow the eschatological demand (give to God what is God's) to be fully obeyed. We can put this in Pauline terms by saying it means a call to love and an attempt to prepare for the approaching day of Jesus Christ.

We can point to the idea that Roman State emperor worship is where the State had exceeded its proper bounds. When it did this the Christian was obligated to disobey and to radically oppose the State.

The refusal to offer sacrifice to the image of Caesar and to utter the *kyrios Kaiser* had made condemnation to death the compulsory consequence. And every true Christian has to refuse this demand, even, even, if, in accordance with the instructions of Jesus and Paul, he was ever so loyal. They would have acted against the teaching of Jesus and of Paul if they had submitted at this point. If the Roman State had had a loyalty-test in any other form than that of emperor worship which was blasphemous for the Christian, the Christians would have been able to meet it in good conscience, and much bloodshed would have been avoided.<sup>8</sup>

It is at this point then when the Christian must say no to the State with all the courage that he has. This means that when the State claims ultimate authority for itself the Christian must rise up and

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Cullmann, op. cit., p. 79.

say no. If, and when, the United States government feels that they have the absolute and ultimate authority to determine the future events of the world and other nations then we must say no. Our government must realize its own provisional nature. It has no right to determine the events and control the lives of others. The real tension lies in the understanding of the "already fulfilled" and "not yet completed." The Christian then cannot view any State as representing the final and ultimate authority over worldly and human conduct. When this happens he has the obligation to disobey.

The Christians' relationship to the State must be seen first of all in temporal categories. The importance of this will be expanded upon in our section on the theology of hope. The State is seen as something that is "provisional." It is because of this that we are not able to find anywhere in the New Testament a complete renunciation of the State as a matter of principle. At the same time we do not find an uncritical acceptance of the State as though it represented something that was final or definitive. Cullmann says, "the State is not simply divine, as is usually inferred from Romans 13:1ff.. It is merely willed by God, "ordained of God."<sup>9</sup>

We note therefore that it is not up to the disciples of Jesus to assume that they have to take the initiative to abolish the State as an institution. Instead they must give to the State what it needs for its own existence. At the same time we must also say that as soon

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 62.

as the State demands more than is necessary for its own existence, meaning when it demands that which belongs to God - ultimate loyalty, then it has transgressed its limits. Surely the disciples of Jesus are relieved of any obligation to this kind of requirement that is made by any State.

We must note then that there are no passages in the New Testament that can be used to oppose or to justify the resistance. We can only make general statements from the teachings of Jesus and what I have labeled his critical attitude toward the State. His view of the State is seen only in light of his eschatological understanding. This same thing is true for Paul. The end was close and we must be prepared for the final time. Therefore we see their attitude representing a casual acceptance of the authority of the State and a need for its existence in order to maintain an order in society. But we can say that the ultimate allegiance of the Christian, in both Jesus' and Paul's understanding, belonged to God and to God alone. We can best summarize this section by a quote from Cullmann:

The Church's task with regard to the State, which is posed for all time, is thus clear. First, it must loyally give the State everything necessary to its existence. It has to oppose anarchy and all Zealotism within its own ranks. Second, it has to fulfill the office of watchman over the State. That means: it must remain in principle critical toward every State and be ready to warn it against transgression of its legitimate limits. Third, it must deny to the State which exceeds its limits whatever such a State demands that lies within the province of religio-ideological excess; and in its preaching the Church must courageously describe this excess as opposition to God.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

### The Kingdom of God and Eschatology

Our previous discussion about the New Testament and its understanding of the State points out the need for our realization of the importance of the Kingdom of God. Pannenberg points out the Kingdom of God is that perfect society of men which is to be realized in history by God Himself.<sup>11</sup> This must surely be our starting point. No man can propose to think that he is capable of setting up the Kingdom of God all by himself.

The State as viewed by the New Testament writings was seen as something necessary under the existing conditions of society. It presupposes the coming of the Kingdom of God. It is for this that the early Christians were to patiently await. It was the future hope seen in light of the meaning of eschatology. Cullmann also points this same thing out when he says, "Surely the Kingdom of God should be of infinitely more value to us than the State; but it is wrong to attack the State violently in order to set up the Kingdom of God."<sup>12</sup> We shall discuss more completely the relationship of the coming of the Kingdom of God in our section of God's action in history.

Our present view of the world and what is happening points out the real dicotomy of the world and the Kingdom of God. We see scores

---

<sup>11</sup>Wolfhart Pannenberg, Theology and the Kingdom of God (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), p. 76.

<sup>12</sup>Cullmann, op. cit., p. 21.

of injustices, brutalities and wars that make this clearly obvious to us. The Kingdom of God is not present in human society. It is precisely at this point that calls man's radical obedience to the present moment. He sees the realities of the present world and has the vision that a better world will come. Pannenberg believes that the Christian commits his life to the goal of bringing off a better world. This is what gives the initiative for our involvement in political activity. The future Kingdom of God, because we see that it belongs to God, surely can mean nothing less than complete commitment in the present. Pannenberg says, "The future of the Kingdom releases a dynamic in the present that again and again kindles the vision of man and gives meaning to this fervent quest for the political forms of justice and love."<sup>13</sup> When we say this we must also realize that any amount of justice and love that we may achieve in bringing about must always be contrasted with God's future. This means that we must view our acts as provisional and preliminary rather than final and ultimate. Pannenberg goes on to say that all of our acts must give way to new and better forms.<sup>14</sup> This points out to us the provisional nature of man's involvement. This is basic to the understanding of the tension that must always be present between the committed Christian and the State he resides in. Man himself begins to play God if he sees his

---

<sup>13</sup>Pannenberg, op. cit., p. 80.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

activity as being anything other than provisional. Nonetheless the committed Christian cannot ignore the importance of his responsibilities in present society with all of its brutalities and injustices. He must strive to build a new and better social order precisely for the sake of the future Kingdom. We must not view justice and love as being relevant to only the individual. They must be seen as part of the basic structure of human interaction in all areas of life. When the Christian realizes this he then understands the nature of the Kingdom of God being political. It will require his obedience to respond to present needs by answering the call of God to action in the present for the sake of the future possibility.

Pannenberg realizes that ethics must be founded on the idea of the coming of the Kingdom of God. It will require concrete consequences and specific forms of action in the present. These consequences and actions cannot be outlined exhaustively or conclusively. This means that we must not view the Kingdom of God as a program for social change. At the same time we must realize that our view of the coming Kingdom surely must help to shape the programs that are required by particular situations. We still need to see the provisional nature of our programs. Even those programs that are most completely in line with the idea of the coming Kingdom of God are themselves still seen as being preliminary.<sup>15</sup>

This is what causes a paradox for modern man. He must indeed

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 116.

act, yet at the same time he must realize that his acts are not final. They are part of the process that God Himself is using to bring about the Kingdom of God. Panningberg says we must begin then with the realization that the Kingdom of God is understood to be the eschatological future that is "brought about by God Himself."<sup>16</sup> Man alone is not capable of doing it. When we see the future in this light it is then possible to comprehend the meaning of man as a historical being. This means that man must participate in the process of history. God's rule can not be seen as something simply in the future. It would be unfair to say that man is left to do nothing except to wait quietly for the final arrival of the Kingdom of God. Absolutely not, this would be unfair to the teachings of Jesus. Jesus' own proclamations of the Kingdom of God point out that "the future and the present are inextricably interwoven" together.<sup>17</sup>

## II. CHURCH TRADITION

A second source of authority is the teachings of the Church. We will discuss the concept of just-war. Just-war has been used to justify warfare by the churches and by the State. The discussion will include the basic concepts of the just-war theory and point out the way they relate to Vietnam.

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 53. <sup>17</sup>Ibid.



### Historical Aspects of the Just-War

The basic presuppositions of just-war theory say some wars are justified. It means it is alright for the individual Christian to participate in warfare as long as certain criteria are present. The early Church was strongly opposed to military participation in any form at all. As the Christian community began to discover that the eminent return of Jesus was not going to take place, they began to formulate a different attitude to the world. They started to realize their responsibility to the earthly life. This is seen by the attitude of the early Church fathers like Tertullianus and Origenes.

Cadoux summarizes the position of the early Church around 180-250 A.D.:

...most of the writers of this period use at times expressions of varying degrees of deliberateness--tacitly or explicitly recognizing the relative rightfulness of war. Sometimes it is a purely unconscious and non-committal allusion to war as a familiar human institution: sometimes it is brought in for the sake of argument, the author temporarily adopting the ordinary standpoint of the world: sometimes it amounts to a full, though relative, approval. But not even this last, nor, a fortiori, either of the other two, carries with it the belief that a Christian could consistently be a soldier.<sup>18</sup>

The Church became more and more involved in the world as time progressed. They began to realize they had to assume a new responsibility. Slowly the pacifism of the early Church began to disappear. The Christian was beginning to change his relationship to the world. The time of Constantine became all important. His victory for the Church changed the direction. Cadoux puts it this way:

---

<sup>18</sup> John Cadoux, The Early Church and the World (Edinburgh: Clark, 1955), p. 412.

Official Christianity was now committed to the sanction of war--so far as the practical conduct of Christian men as citizens was concerned--whenever the State chose to wage it. Further than that, the decision not only settled the practical question for the moment and doomed the dissentient voices--many as they still were--to ultimate silence, but it tied up the freedom of Christian thought, and made any unfettered discussion of the problem on its merits next to impossible for centuries to come.<sup>19</sup>

From this point on the Christian spokesman began to gradually develop more and more an affirmation for participating in war. The just-war theory slowly emerged as the basis for understanding Christian responsibility for aspects of war.

Roland Bainton feels that Ambrose was the first Christian thinker to formulate an ethic of war.<sup>20</sup> Defense of the empire coincided with the defense of the faith. Ambrose supplied two of the basic tenets of the just-war. First, the conduct of the war should be just. Second, monks and priests should abstain from participating in the war.

Augustine was among the first to delineate the doctrine from a Christian perspective. He expanded where Ambrose left off. Augustine based his entire discussion on the aspect of man's sins. His thinking cannot be separated from his writings in the two cities doctrine. Basic to his assumptions is the idea that the city of God is always hoped for. For Augustine, just-war was not the assertion that war was just. Rather war was inherently evil. Just-war doctrine was for him a statement of our involvement in sin. A Christian could only partici-

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 592.

<sup>20</sup>Roland H. Bainton, Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 89-90.

pate in war in profound misery. Augustine went so far as to say that the Christian was to serve forty days of penance after participating in war. The implication is that it may be better to serve in war than not to serve in it. It involved choosing the lesser of two evils. The purpose of participating in war was to create a better society.

There are several basic aspects of Augustine's private understanding of Christian participating in war. His position has formed the backbone of the contemporary understanding of just-war.

Augustine felt the intent of the war was to be just. This intent must of course be to restore peace.

Peace should be the object of your desire. War should be waged only as a necessity and waged only that through it God may deliver men from that necessity and preserve them in peace. For peace is not to be sought in order to kindle war, but war is to be waged in order to obtain peace. Therefore even in the course of war you should cherish the spirit of a peace maker.<sup>21</sup>

One of the purposes of conducting war is to vindicate justice. Augustine felt that if the existence of the State was attacked then the attackers should be repulsed by war. Therefore when an injustice had taken place it was proper to carry on war to correct the injustice.<sup>22</sup>

Augustine also believed war should be just in its disposition. The disposition should be Christian love. Augustine did not feel that Christian love was incompatible with killing. The reason he felt this way was because he believed love and non-resistance were inward dispositions. This is obvious from his quote:

---

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 95-96.    <sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 96.

If it is supposed that God could not enjoin warfare because in after times it was said by the Lord Jesus Christ, 'I say unto you, resist not evil...', the answer is that what is here required is not a bodily action but an inward disposition... Moses in putting to death sinners was moved not by cruelty but by love. So also was Paul when he committed the offender to Satan for the destruction of his flesh. Love does not preclude a benevolent severity, nor that correction which compassion itself dictates. No one indeed is fit to inflict punishment save the one who has first overcome hate in his heart. The love of enemies admits of no dispensation, but love does not exclude wars of mercy waged by the good.<sup>23</sup>

Another point that Augustine felt was important was that war be declared by proper authority. The ruler is the only one that has authority to declare and wage war. A man who had been constituted the proper authority was justified in taking up the sword. The soldier must leave the decision to his lord and obey the emperor.<sup>24</sup>

Augustine also stated that the conduct of the war must be just. The rules of conduct that he used were taken from classical antiquity. Faith must be kept with the enemy. There was to be no unnecessary violence. Temples should not be profaned. There should be no looting or massacres. There was no allowance for vengeance, atrocities and reprisals.<sup>25</sup>

Throughout the thought and writings of Augustine one feels a mournful mood. War is seen as a necessary evil. One who participates in it regardless of the reason, is still committing a sin.

This brief discussion is intended to point out certain aspects of the origin of just-war. It has been further refined by other Christian thinkers through the centuries. Certain other principles

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 97. <sup>24</sup>Ibid. <sup>25</sup>Ibid.

have been added to substantiate and clarify the proper conduct of war from a Christian perspective. Some of the other more significant aspects need to be mentioned. One is the concept of last resort. This means that war should be used only as a final resort when all other means of settling the dispute have been exhausted. The intention of the war should also be announced. This means that those who are carrying on the battle should make clear what they are hoping to accomplish by the war so each side is aware of what the other desires. There must also be a reasonable hope of victory. This means that the war can be carried on only if there is a reasonable possibility that it can be won. One final aspect that we need to mention is the concept of due proportion. This means that the war shall be conducted only if the good that arises out of it is greater than the amount of damage that takes place during the occurrence of the war.

We conclude our historical understanding by raising four basic aspects that are derived from the just-war theory. We first realize basic theological affirmations. The basic one is that God has created the universe and he governs over it according to his moral laws. Second, we see the need for a confession to ultimate loyalties. This ultimate loyalty is that we must obey God rather than man. When God's moral laws are violated, it is the Christian's responsibility to say he cannot participate. This means we obey God rather than man. The State does not have the right to demand the ultimate loyalty of the Christian. There are also certain theologically derived ethical norms. Just-war theory holds that God forbids me to participate in a society in which these norms are violated. This means that if the State requires me to

participate in a war then that war must be a justifiable one under the basis of our previous discussion. We could also conclude that God commands me to help change the society that is committing an injustice. God forbids me to participate in wars that are not justifiable.

### Vietnam and the Just-War Theory

We see the basic aspects of the just-war theory. The theory has been reformulated and expanded to great length. Certain Christian ethicists raise a number of basic issues regarding its contemporary relevance.<sup>26</sup> The most important aspect is the underlying threat of nuclear war. Some Christian thinkers feel that because of the fear of nuclear destruction there can be no basis for affirming war in any manner any longer. Another basic challenge that is raised is the problem of non-combatants. We live in an age of technology where nearly everyone is in some way related to war. This may be through building firearms, weapon research or even paying war taxes. Because of this, it is difficult to determine what constitutes non-combatant status.

But in spite of the difficulties in the use of just-war theory it is the only guide that the Church has in determining justifiable warfare. We therefore realize its importance in deciding how and when a war is justifiable. Many Christian ethicists who justify the tenets

---

<sup>26</sup>For further information on this subject see one of the following: Paul Ramsey, The Just War (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967); Zahn, op. cit.; Ralph Potter, War and Moral Discourse (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1969).

of just-war raise serious questions about the present situation in Southeast Asia. Ralph Potter has outlined certain aspects of the just-war theory and tried to show how they relate to the present conflict in Vietnam. These are delineated in the following section.<sup>27</sup>

Justifying cause. Just-war theory states that there must be a clear act of injustice by one country toward another. The United States has interfered in a civil war. Prior to the buildup of forces by the United States there was no clear act of aggression across any established international boundaries. Because of this there can be no argument for legitimate self-defense. We therefore have no justifiable reason for fighting in Vietnam.

Last resort. Just-war theory states that war can be justified only as a last resort when other possible means of finding a solution have been used up. This war is unjust because all means of conciliation have not been exhausted. Intentions of the willingness to negotiate have not been used to full advantage. Therefore we cannot say we are justifying our action by saying we are using war as a last resort.

Highest lawful authority. Just-war theory holds that only the highest lawful authority has the right to declare war. The war is not being conducted under lawful authority. South Vietnam is not an independent sovereign state. The United Nations is the highest world

---

<sup>27</sup>Potter, Ibid., p.43-44.

public authority and it surely has not authorized military action. Therefore we are not fighting in Vietnam because of a decision made by the highest lawful authority.

Announcement of intention. Just-war theory states that the intention of the nations involved be made known to each other. We have made no announcement of our intention to begin hostilities. No stipulations have been given about how our aggression might be avoided. We have not had this kind of communication with the enemy. We therefore have not made our intentions clear.

No reasonable hope of victory. Just-war holds that if a war is to be waged then there must be a reasonable hope for victory. The North Vietnam leaders have not responded to our action in the way we thought. They continue to have the commitment and the courage to fight us till the bitter end. Guerrilla warfare can and will probably persist indefinitely in the south destroying all of our efforts. Therefore there is no reasonable hope of victory.

Just intentions. Just-war theory states that a war may be waged only if the intentions are just. Just intentions should be to vindicate justice. There is no way of getting around the understanding that part of the reason we are in Vietnam is to preserve American prestige. We maintain that we must demonstrate our credibility to our allies. We cannot say that we are simply defending an innocent South Vietnamese from an external unjust aggressor. We are devastating a land because of our geopolitical interests in containing Red China. Therefore we



are not fighting with just intentions.

Due proportion. Just-war theory holds that the amount of good that arises as a result of the war must surpass the damage and destruction. We are spending lives and money far in excess of due proportion. The good that we hope to accomplish cannot possibly balance the evil that is being done to the Vietnamese. We are destroying domestic tranquillity and the status of the United States in world opinion. We are therefore exceeding the limits of due proportion.

Just means. Just-war theory points out that the countries involved in war must conduct the war with just methods. We have not confined our conduct to the war by using just means. We have been guilty of indiscriminate attacks on innocent noncombatants because of our use of napalm, area bombing, and destruction of crops. Melman in his book, In the Name of America,<sup>28</sup> outlines many atrocities that have been carried out by both the United States and the Vietnamese people. Therefore we have not used just means in conducting this war.

The man of Christian conscience then cannot ignore reviewing the concept of just-war. The teaching of the Church must be considered by an individual when he is trying to realize his responsibility in relating to the problems of international war. When he makes his decision to participate or to oppose participation he should be aware of the concepts that we have discussed here. This will enable him to have a

---

<sup>28</sup>Seymour Melman, In the Name of America (New York: Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, 1968).

clearer picture of his duty and obligation. It can also be used as a way of judging our action in light of the way Church tradition and teaching have seen the problem.

### III. PERSONAL MORAL JUDGMENT

#### The Meaning of Conscience

Let us now turn to the question of personal moral judgment and discuss the meaning and matter of conscience. Human destiny must see itself in light of the meaning of the individual's own self awareness and his consciousness. A person's self awareness provides the base for his conscience. The conscience of an individual will determine his conduct. The way each individual acts on his conscience will have an effect on human destiny. Pannenberg says, "The manner in which the unity of human destiny emerges as the standard for self-evaluation and for conduct is known as the conscience."<sup>29</sup>

A state of tension may arise as a result of the individual's perception of society and how he relates to it. This is particularly true for the resistance. Society and the State set up certain morals and laws about individual conduct and action. The individual may discover a state of conflict when he feels he cannot obey the morals and laws that have been set up by society and the State. A young man who is faced with the decision about what he will do in response to the

---

<sup>29</sup>Wolfgang Pannenberg, What is Man? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), p. 87.

draft, and in particular the war in Vietnam, may discover he has to do something that is opposed to the system. When he does this he is often confronted with his social obligations. People warn him that his actions will affect many others and he must take this into consideration when he decides on a certain act. A man for example may choose to break the law and go to prison for the sake of his conscience. If he is married and has a family this will affect their lives too. This is ofcourse a difficult decision to make. Franz Jägerstätter had to make this decision in response to the situation in Hitler's Germany during the Second World War. He paid the ultimate price by giving his life and he was put to death because of his refusal to comply with the demands of Hitler. His response to this question was:

. . . people stress the obligations of conscience as they concern my wife and children. But I cannot believe that, just because one has a wife and children he is free to offend God by lying--not to mention all the other things he would be called to do (i.e. by accepting military service). Did not Christ Himself say, 'He who loves father, mother, or children more than Me is not deserving of My love'?<sup>30</sup>

He must therefore be held up as an example of a man who obeyed his conscience in spite of his social responsibilities to his family. Kierkegaard also spoke of the significance and importance of the individual and his own ethical freedom:

Demoralized by too assiduous and absorption in world-historical considerations, people no longer have any will for anything except what is world-historically significant, no concern for anything but the accidental, the world-historical outcome, instead of

---

<sup>30</sup>Gordon C. Zahn, War, Conscience and Dissent (New York: Hawthorn, 1967), p. 190.

concerning themselves solely with the essential, the inner spirit, the ethical freedom.<sup>31</sup>

These two quotes then help to point out the need for individual reflection to realize the significance of his own personal conduct and behavior apart from its greater impact on society.

When an individual is informed by his perspective on law what should he do before deciding conscientiously whether or not to obey it? The first thing that we must say is that he needs to make the final decision himself. He shall at the same time realize his social responsibility. If he professes the Christian faith his decision should be guided by Scripture and Church tradition. If an individual is to be free and responsible, he alone can be the one to make the decisions about what laws to obey and what ones to disobey. Mulford Sibley points out that when an individual makes the decision he must recognize that he is intimately connected with other human beings and his decision is going to affect them as well.<sup>32</sup> No personality can develop except in a group. Every individual then owes a debt to the human group that has helped form his personality. Any obligation that we have must be rooted in the idea that we need to be grateful for human life. Yet this obligation must be seen from several directions. The person has an obligation to himself. He has an obligation to others.

---

<sup>31</sup>Soren Kierkegaard, Unscientific Postscript (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941), p. 121.

<sup>32</sup>Mulford Q. Sibley, The Obligation to Disobey, Conscience and the Law (New York: Council on Religion and International Affairs, 1970), p. 116.

He has an obligation to the groups of which he is a part. He also has an obligation to the State.

Secondly, Sibley informs us that the conscience must be informed.<sup>33</sup> He needs to be clear about his own value system. His value may be based on natural law. He may feel that his convictions arise from a Kantian ethic--that everybody else would do the same thing under the same circumstances if they perceived the situation in the same way. He may have some version of the Golden Rule--Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Any number of other value systems might be possibilities. He needs to know why he decides to do what he decides. He must also use his capacity to reason as he formulates his own position. He must be fully aware of the consequences of his act, even though it may be difficult for him to assess them. Finally, he should also test his provisional conclusions with the experiences of his other acquaintances before he makes his choice.

Sibley also points out another possibility of viewing how one derives his final choice:

On the other hand, there have at times been interpretations which have emphasized the supposedly inner nature of conscience, the implication being that its guidance comes wholly from within the person or at least vertically to the person from God.<sup>34</sup>

Sibley goes on to say conscience may be shaped in a social environment but it also extends beyond reason in two ways.<sup>35</sup> The first, we may label ultimate or first-order value judgments. It may be seen intuitively or another way of putting it is by saying it is self-evident.

---

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 117. <sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 11. <sup>35</sup>Ibid., pp. 13-14.

It is the point where reason must stop. The premises themselves are derived from something that is beyond reason. There is no reason for it, one just feels that it is what he has to do. The second is a kind of leap of faith that goes beyond reason arising from a particular situation. Reason is important because it informs our minds about certain information and we consider all of the available evidence. However reason alone cannot bring about the final answer. We can apply general principles to particulars but ultimately we must make a "leap over" when the final decision is made.

There is no reason that some uniformity in conduct is not also the result of conscience. This of course would presumably be the ideal situation. It is basic to the thought of natural law. Everyone discovers they are doing the same thing because it is the natural way of doing it. All people realize that it must be done a certain way. This is true even from the perspective of the military. It would be much better if most of the men were fighting in Vietnam because their consciences dictated this action for them. The problem is, this is not true in actual fact. Many who are in Vietnam are coerced by the opinions of others. Some people are just afraid to say no because they fear the consequences. Some conform simply because most of the others are doing the same thing. I am sure that military morale would be much higher if all the soldiers serving in Vietnam had joined because of deep conscientious convictions about the war.

We must say then that conscience must be considered when making a moral decision. It indeed has its place in the process of decision making especially as it relates the problem of resistance. The person

must be held responsible for the action that he chooses to take in relationship to the situation in Southeast Asia. Yet one is morally obliged to do certain things before he finally settles on a conscientious conviction. He must decide between conformity and non-conformity to a particular law. He must make a decision when he determines whether or not he will become a resister. I quote from Milford Sibley as he sums these up:

We offer these considerations: (1) Legal obligation roots in a broad conception of moral obligation, which in turn must be related to the social nature of man. (2) Social life is pluralistic, and this must be taken into account when formulating a conscience on a particular question. (3) There is an obligation to humanity. (4) State law does not necessarily have any greater claim on me than other forms of law, including the legislation I enact for myself. (5) One should test one's tentative judgments according to several criteria.<sup>36</sup>

### The Decision to Disobey

We have stated three sources for the claims of authority in making a conscientious decision. We started with the Scripture to give us a perspective of how the New Testament understands the relationship of the Christian to the State. We also discussed the meaning of the Kingdom of God. This was followed by a discussion of Church tradition and the concept of the just-war theory. Finally, we discussed the implications of the personal judgment of the individual based on an understanding of the conscience.

---

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 43.

It becomes obvious then that the individual is the one who must make the final decision after considering Scripture and Church tradition. He becomes responsible for his actions and his conduct. The individual alone makes the decision during a period of uncertainty and indeterminacy. He compares his moral experience with that of others. He ought to propose the course of action that he decides to take and compare the opinions of others against his own choice. A recognition needs to be made about the individual's obligation to other people who may be involved. He must seriously examine the viewpoints of others and weigh their implications as they relate to the development of his own conscience. The individual should feel the same as Jefferson stated in the Declaration of Independence, "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind."

The individual then looks at a general law or custom. He listens to how other people respond. He also realizes his debt to society. He then decides how he will respond. This is true whether the conclusion is for obedience or for disobedience. This is the way it was for Luther, after he debated and was confronted by public opinion when he said: "Here I stand, I can do no other." The point is reached when the uncertainty of deliberation must give rise to a determination for action. A decision is forced upon him and the individual responds. Otherwise it means that one becomes absorbed in the mechanical following of convention, dominated by fear or merely submitting to the pressures of the moment. This surely must be seen as being unconscientious. Sibley believes this is true whether the pressures



for decision come from a pressure for conformity or for dissent.<sup>37</sup>

We realize that there may be times when the individual may be acting primarily to preserve his own individual and personal integrity. At other times he may become disobedient in order to change the structures and practices of society. Both of these may be fully justified if done in the framework that has been suggested above.

When one makes the decision to disobey he shall be willing to accept the penalty even if he is not eager to do so. It is on behalf of the interest of society that a law is disobeyed. Sibley states that the penalty is accepted in order to preserve the principle of lawfulness.<sup>38</sup> The decision is made to disobey because it will enable something better to emerge. Hopefully the law that is felt to be unjust will be changed. This will allow for a more just society. Respect for the law is seen as part of the process of disobedience. This has been an affirmation down through history. The following quote serves to illustrate this:

It would seem that Socrates is telling us that we must on occasion violate a given law (as the rule is interpreted by existing administrators and judges) but that we must also recognize the principle of lawfulness by accepting the sanctions attached to violation of the law. The same or essentially the same position was taken by John Locke (at least in matters involving religion), assuming that the ruler is acting within the limits of his general authority. A reading of Martin Luther King's letter from Birmingham jail indicates that he expounded a similar view; and it is well known that King's exemplar, Mohandas Ghandhi, had endorsed it on many occasions. More frequently, former justice Fortas has eloquently restated the argument.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 53. <sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 98. <sup>39</sup>Ibid., pp. 75-76

Pannenberg points out the importance of noting that only a small fraction of man's existence is caused by what we call instinctive behavior.<sup>40</sup> Beyond what is instinctive man must decide the purpose to which he will commit his efforts. He determines what he is willing to give his life to. That is to say, he must search for what it means to be a man. He has to make up his own mind about what he wants and what he is living for.

We conclude then that the individual is responsible for his actions. This is seen in two directions. He must see himself responding to the calling of God and the demand that the Gospel makes upon his life. He must see himself as the transformer of the existing order to bring about a better world. Secondly, he must realize that he alone is responsible for deciding whether or not to obey the law. The individual alone must go through the process of discovering where his obligations begin and where they end. The Christian response must begin from an understanding of the Scriptural base. It should consider the teachings of the Church. Through the individual's use of these resources he learns to make his own conscientious decision.

---

<sup>40</sup>Pannenberg, What's Man?, p. 54.

## CHAPTER III

### A THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATION FOR A

#### CONTEMPORARY STATEMENT ABOUT THE RESISTANCE

My theological base is two-fold. First is the idea that God does indeed act in history. God's action is continued in the present by those movements that strive to build a better world. Second is a theology of hope. It is my conviction that the future of the world rests in a hope that God's promise of salvation shall continue to be fulfilled. We will discuss this from two directions. First is the understanding of God's action in history from the writings of Wolfhart Pannenberg. Second is the theology of hope formulated by Jürgen Moltmann.

The first part deals with God's action in history. We first talk about man's openness to the world. A discussion about the problem of self interest is included. Unity and national interest are seen as two aspects that must be given consideration. We close this with a proposal that God is acting through the resistance movement to bring about a better world.

The theology of hope will include a discussion about the identity of the Christian and the Church. We understand the purpose of man is related to transforming society. Our action is motivated because of a hope for a better future. We conclude with a discussion about man's responsibility and individual involvement.

## I. GOD'S ACTION IN HISTORY

This section will attempt to point out the relation of God to the world. It is based on the theology of Wolfhart Pannenberg. Pannenberg's theology focuses on God's action in history. It is my understanding that the movements in society that humanize the world are seen as the acts of God. Man is responsible for responding to the call of God on his life. Many times people respond to build a better society and make no claim of relationship to God. This section will attempt to formulate that even though a man may not acknowledge God as being responsible for what he does, it is God who is acting through him. This may mean that even though God may not be acknowledged in the process, the underlying force that pushes men to respond is seen as one of the ways that God does act in history.

### Open to the World.

According to Pannenberg, anthropology has discovered many things about the nature of man and his relation to the natural order of the world.<sup>1</sup> He states that one of the newly discovered aspects is man's unique freedom to inquire and move beyond any given aspect of his existence. This is called "openness to the world." This short phrase states the characteristic that makes man a man. This is what distinguishes him from the other animals. It lifts man beyond and

---

<sup>1</sup>Wolfhart Pannenberg, What is Man? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), p. 3.

above non-human nature in general.

It is stated by Pannenberg that man is not bound to his environment. He is open to the world. This means that he will always be able to participate in new experiences that are different from the past. Man is seen to have many various possibilities for responding to forces and decisions affecting his life. These responses can vary almost without limit. It means that man is free from the environmental drives that control most other animal life. Most life has to respond to the environment itself if it is to exist. For man this is not true. His responses are undefined. The fact is that man helps to define his own responses. The influence of man on his environment is strongly determined by man's individual choices. Pannenberg believes that education and custom has some effect on this.<sup>2</sup> But for the most part we must say that man is not limited by his environment. He is capable of extending his activity far beyond the natural environment. His abilities and his creative mind are what allow him to do this.

This does not imply however that man is totally free to do anything that he feels so inclined to do. Man realizes his own finiteness. As he strives to find his relationship to the world he soon discovers that there are many things that he is not capable of understanding. This means that he must begin to look beyond himself to discover something else. Pannenberg summarizes this with a very poignant statement:

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

Man's openness to the world presupposes a relation to God. Where there is no explicit clarity about this, the expression open to the world remains unclear. It can be misunderstood to mean that man is oriented toward the world, while it really involves the necessity that man inquire beyond everything that he comes across as his world. This peculiarity of human existence, man's infinite dependence, is understandable only as the question about God. Man's unlimited openness to the world results only from his destiny beyond the world.<sup>3</sup>

The transcendence of God is seen as the over riding force in society. Man is able to react and respond to the world in many different ways. But only when man looks beyond the world, to the eternal, does he realize his true relationship to the world and to God. When this happens man sees himself as a part of God's action in the world. Man must view his acts only in light of their future effect on the world. He must see his destiny in this light. Only as man begins to ponder his existence in relationship to God can he begin to comprehend the validity of his action. This process of reflection becomes extremely significant for the Christian.

Pannenberg's thesis is that man's openness to the world is directed toward God.<sup>4</sup> It includes all aspects of life that relate to man in the world. Another way of putting this is to say that man's openness to the world really means man's openness to God. The destiny of man is seen as community with God. This is the movement that takes place in the world as man attempts to discover his relationship to life. Community with God is actualized when man's life is aimed toward God. When man's life is aimed toward God, it means to accept one's own

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 12. <sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 54-55.

responsibility for his acts. Man assumes his own responsibility. This allows man to see his destiny and it becomes a reality for this life. Once a man has discovered this movement in history it means that he will not stop along the way. Man therefore assumes responsibility for this world by responding to the demand of God. It is my own position that even when Christians do not respond, God may still act. This takes place during those moments when men or groups are raised up in history to carry on specific acts that help to humanize society. These movements may be conducted by individuals who have no identification with the Christian community or even with God. I am convinced that these acts are to be seen as a result of God's activity in history. In spite of the fact that man may not always respond in the proper way it does not mean that there is a limitation to what God can do. God's actions then include those historical moments that are seen to set man free and deliver him from bondage of inhumanity and injustice.

#### The Problem of Self-interest.

When we talk about the openness to the world we have to deal with the problem of self-interest. It is important to discuss this because we need to realize one of man's shortcomings. Self-interest prevents man from realizing his true relationship to God and to the world. Pannenberg states that the power of the imagination is extremely important.<sup>5</sup> One of the principle features in human behavior is

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 23.

seen in his ability to be imaginative. Human behavior has a kind of free and aimless playful character. Pannenberg believes that behavior remains this way until man starts to force his conduct and limit his behavior to self-imposed goals.<sup>6</sup> Narrow self-interests begin to emerge. The power of the creative imagination tends to be subverted to other goals. Man loses the vision of his freedom. It is also true that man may become blinded to the truth. When this happens, man is not able to see beyond his own wishes and desires. Man then tries to force other people to accept the same understanding. He imposes his hopes on others and feels that they too should agree with his wishes. This is often what happens in the realm of political power.

A politician can easily fall into this trap. He has to play a double role. He is elected to serve the people. Yet at the same time he must realize that he needs to strive for the common good. It is not enough for him to simply do what his constituents want done. He may have to run the risk of alienation from society when he discovers that the desires of the people are not in the best interest of the common good. This is best exemplified by the narrow concerns of politicians in the government. They represent a mind-set that is surely not in the interest of the common good because of their own private interests. The politician then has an obligation to see beyond the moment. He needs to have the courage to realize the difference between the desires of the people and what is best for the common good.

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.



Man is given the authority and the responsibility to creatively and freely participate in society. His responsibility is what makes him stand out above other animals. Pannenberg believes that this is where the extent and the use of political power must be limited.<sup>7</sup> The State can control the individual so far, and beyond that limit it has no authority to dictate. You will recall our discussion in the first section where we reviewed the ethic of the New Testament. When the State demands ultimate allegiance it becomes idolatry. When this happens it is the responsibility of the individual Christian to stand up and say no to the State. Basic to this is the fact that individuals represent the purpose of society. Self-government cannot be separated from the concept of modern democratic thought. The people are the sovereigns. The problems emerge when narrow-minded self-interests gain control over the common good.

When we view government in this way it is not possible to have a government without the consent of the majority of the people. Even with this we note that there will be minorities. These minorities may be extremely small in number. Nonetheless these minorities have the right to exercise their political power. This means that they have the right, in open contest, to try to convince the majority that it may be wrong. This is done by supporting candidates and programs that represent real alternatives. One must have a great deal of money to support a candidate of his choice if he differs from the main line politi-

---

<sup>7</sup>Wolfhart Pannenberg, Theology and the Kingdom of God (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), p. 121.

cal opinions of the two-party line. However we can note that some significant changes can take place through grass-root activity. We will go into further detail about this when we discuss the Moratorium committee in a later section. A free democratic society requires that the individual express his opinions and his views. This way, views can be challenged. It is a way of discovering which side represents the narrow self-interests of a few or if it represents the broader general good of humanity.

Pannenberg is convinced that the general welfare will strive in a society that is open.<sup>8</sup> It is possible for a universal spirit to unite individuals and lead them beyond their own narrow self-interests. This is not possible to achieve unless this spirit of universal corporateness can live in peace with the rest of the world. Liberal institutions can grow and thrive only where it is possible to have freedom and equality. The general welfare is seen best in the manifestation of the sovereignty of God over his people. When God is recognized as the sovereign it then becomes possible for man to seek the common good beyond the narrow confines of his own self-interest. He then views the entire world as important and realizes that man is not the judge of his own actions in the ultimate sense.

#### The Problem of Unity and National Interest.

Man is prone to the sin of his own selfish narrow-minded inter-

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 123.

est in individual life. The same thing is true with nations. They fall into the trap of national interests. They do what they think is best in the interest of their own nation while ignoring the rest of the world.

Men tend to be individuals in all areas of social life. This is true when a man joins forces with others whether they be temporary or more permanent. He may join groups and projects either by the necessity of a given situation or by freely choosing them. The self-interest of the group will be a rallying point, but self-interest must not be the controlling force. Pannenberg says, "Each group must remain open for service to complementary or to more comprehensive forms of community."<sup>9</sup> When they remain closed and narrow-minded by their own self-interest they lose their relationship to human destiny. Human destiny, ultimately, must include all men. This aspect of life cannot be ignored by any group or community of individuals.

One of the oldest principles of Christian ethics is the universality of the one God. This correspondingly allows us to see the vision of the unity of all mankind. It is not possible for peace to exist when national interest is given priority over the community of mankind. John Swomley has recently published a book, American Empire, the Political Ethics of Twentieth-Century Conquest, where he raises this question.<sup>10</sup> This book presents a critical analysis about the United

---

<sup>9</sup>Pannenberg, What is Man? p. 94.

<sup>10</sup>John M. Swomley, American Empire the Political Ethics of Twentieth-Century Conquest (New York: Macmillan, 1970).

States foreign policy. The assumption in the book is that the United States has used national interest as its rallying point in foreign policy. Swomley points out the error of our conduct in recent wars, from Pearl Harbor to Vietnam. His basic assumption is that we have dominated the world and tried to make it fit into the mold of what we think is in the best interest of our own country while ignoring the needs of the other developing nations. We are perhaps for the first time realizing the importance of our mistakes and narrow self-interests. Pannenberg points out, "Certainly, any attempt in our day to realize the unity of mankind by imposing the uniformity of an empire must be regarded as utopian and frightening."<sup>11</sup> We are suddenly realizing that the imperialist model is not a good option in trying to achieve unity. It is surely not viable today under our present circumstances of world disorder and pluralism. We must now recognize the need to identify how we can truly achieve peace for all mankind. We must intensify our awareness of pluralistic concerns. We have to acknowledge the different national concerns and cultural styles that exist on our planet. Other nations and cultural styles have a right to exist. We need to recognize this and then we can begin to live in a more harmonious relationship with other nations. No individual nation can take upon its shoulders the right to play God.

We then recognize the dependence of human striving on God. This helps to answer the question of what constitutes the unity of man.

---

<sup>11</sup>Pannenberg, *Theology*, p. 125.

This includes the unity of all reality. It binds together the unity of man's existence. We realize the basis of this unity lies not in ourselves but in God. God is seen as the creator of the world and gives meaning to its unity in its diversity. God also brings salvation to the world and helps us to realize the wholeness of our existence. This is what brings us together above the narrow-mindedness of our own self-interests. It helps to allow for an openness to the world.

We realize then that the goal of man's existence is to be open to the world and to seek community with God. Man also strives to bring about the unity of human existence. A tension exists between the desire for unity and the present status of the world. Man must set his goals to bring about this unity. The problem emerges when he lets his own interests or the national interests of the State gain control over a vision of world unity. He fails in his task to bring about unity when he falls short of the goal and there is a lack of justice in the human community. This makes us aware of our dependence on God as we attempt to become truly human. The transcendence of God is what unifies the reality of the world. Human existence then lies in this tension of striving for unity and the common good. The tension exists as a result of man's self-centeredness and his inability to be open to the world.

Nevertheless man must strive for this unity. When we view ourselves as expressing God's love then we help to bring about that unity. The unity comes about as we strive in a common desire for what is the highest good. Pannenberg understands the highest good to refer to the

future of God's Kingdom, even though men may not recognize it. The question then comes down to the motivation of our action. If it is done in a spirit of love then it is expressing the spirit of the Kingdom of God. When our actions help to contribute to self-awareness, unity and peace, then our actions are indeed helping to contribute to the spirit of the Kingdom. Pannenberg describes the lifestyle of a person who is committed to this task. He describes it as having two major aspects.<sup>12</sup> The first aspect is that the individual will find his own personal identity. He knows who he is in relationship to God. He understands his position and place in history. Second, he discovers his identity and integrity through participation in fellowship with other people. He realizes that by himself there is little he can do. But through involvement with other people dedicated to the same goals he can accomplish a great deal. This is what relates him to the larger community of man. He then sees himself related to the whole of mankind. This is seen only in relationship to the end of history:

Placing the manifestation of God at the end of history means that the Biblical God, has, so to speak, his own history. That is, the historical event of revelation cannot be thought of in an outward way as revealing the essence of God. It is not so much the course of history as it is the end of history that is at one with the essence of God. But insofar as the end presupposes the course of history because it is the perfection of it, then also the course of history belongs in essence to the revelation of God, for history receives its unity from its goal.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 118.

<sup>13</sup>Wolfhart Pannenberg (ed.), Revelation as History (New York: Macmillan, 1968), p. 133.

This allows the unity of mankind to be brought about only when we realize the instability of national interests. It must see beyond in order to grasp the reality of all the creation.

Pannenberg considers three essential ideas: unity, the future, and sovereignty.<sup>14</sup> The sovereignty of God is what establishes the unity of mankind. As God becomes the sovereign over the world it is seen as a gift. As the sovereignty begins to unfold, scattered events are unified and their purposes become known. God has the power over the future. "Thus the circle is closed, Jesus' message of the Kingdom of God implies that the unity of the world is to be expected from its future."<sup>15</sup>

#### Human Activity

We cannot comprehend God's activity in the world separate from human actions. Pannenberg understands the process of history to be an instrument of God in educating humanity.<sup>16</sup> It includes bringing man to an awareness of his own history. This is what enables God to complete his creation. History is seen as the process of completing what God has started. Man and his activity must then be viewed as of tantamount importance. God continues his creation by the activity of man in humanizing the world.

---

<sup>14</sup>  
Pannenberg, Theology, p.59.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 60.      <sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 69.

Man must then see the significance of his own activity. He must see beyond his own occupation. It is important to understand human activity in light of the comprehensive plan of God. The entirety of human society becomes important. Our actions need to reflect on the significance of God's sovereignty.

Pannenberg believes that when man lives with a trust in God it helps to overcome anxiety.<sup>17</sup> Man is no longer anxious about himself or his own future. He realizes his own significance and his life takes on meaning because of his trust in God. If man is able to go beyond his own finite situation to a moment of infinite trust, his anxiety disappears. He is thus able to comprehend the meaning of his own finitude. Anxiety is what holds man in slavery to his infinite destiny. Despair separates man from his destiny. It is only in complete trust in God that man is able to overcome the anxiety of the present moments.

It is possible for man to place his ultimate trust in the infinite God, according to Pannenberg.<sup>18</sup> This trust goes beyond anything earthly. The blessings and afflictions and sufferings are accepted thankfully as a gift from the infinite God. This enables a person to live in an appropriate way by responding to his destiny. His trust in God would enable him to use the world. Man would find himself united to his fellowman in a spirit of love. He would radiate joy in everything that he did.

---

<sup>17</sup>Pannenberg, What is Man? p. 64.<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 66.



Pannenberg feels that man can find his relationship to God who has the power of the future.<sup>19</sup> Man is then free when he discovers this. He is free to participate in a truly personal life. He is free to accept the temporariness of everything that takes place. He is not tied down to the demands of nature and of society. Creative love becomes a force in his life that changes the world without destroying it. He thus realizes that the significance of his life rests in God. His life is acted out in response to his vision of what the future of the world should be. He uses the power of creative love to change the world.

Pannenberg's discussion of man formulates a fundamental change in the nature of man's consciousness.<sup>20</sup> This has been experienced in recent times. It is that man is no longer willing to fit into an order of the world or even of nature. Instead, man has a desire to help determine the future of the world. He is no longer satisfied in simply accepting the process of what happens. Rather he is assuming responsibility for the future himself by participating in the process of the ongoingness of history. As he responds to God's call on his life he strives to discover and help create a better world.

Pannenberg states that freedom, like conscience, is also connected with the future.<sup>21</sup> Individuals experience freedom in situations

---

<sup>19</sup> Pannenberg, Theology, p. 69.

<sup>20</sup> Pannenberg, What is Man? p. 1.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 88.

where they find harmony with their destiny. Man's free choice enables him to discover his place in the historic process. He sees that the possibilities for his action and his freedom to act allow him to make his decisions about his conduct. The resister feels a sense of community with the future when he makes a decision to say no to the State.

Natural human activity is seen to be extremely important in theological investigation. Theology has many times put God in the center of action. Man was seen as an auxiliary participant. This is no longer so. God is now seen to speak to the world through human acts and words. Man is no longer simply receptive and silent. Sellers argues that divine action is mediated through human initiative.<sup>22</sup> This is particularly seen in human relationships. It also implies man's active participation in the life of the world. The resistance must be seen as part of this process. If we are able to gain a world view of humanity and if we are to live in peace and harmony it must start now. Many of the resisters are trying to do just this in their human conduct and relations with other people. This can be seen as part of God's present activity in the world.

We are saying that a new world view is in the making. One does not need to have a great deal of scientific aptitude to realize this. The making of this world view has been taking place for some time. The context of reality is seen from viewing the world from a perspective of God's ongoing action in human activity. It means that the future of

---

22

James Sellers, Theological Ethics (New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 46.

the world is dependent upon how man responds in the present to the claim of God upon his life. This is what enables God to continue the process of history. The new future will come about only as God acts through men who respond to action in the present.

Changes begin with a criticism of the present. This criticism starts because the conditions and institutions of the present are not working. They are no longer capable of dealing with the problems of the future. Moltmann's theology of hope informs us that change becomes a realization when it begins to control and propel the process of history.<sup>23</sup> The participants who are criticizing the present must have a clear vision of what they are working and striving for if they are to become successful in their efforts. When this realization is discovered, the impact of the movement will be significant. The criticisms become valid and the change will begin to take place.

The next section will discuss the promise of the future possibility. The Gospel started by the event of the human deed done by God on the Cross. It now continues to be performed by God in the Body of Christ. The body of Christ is not limited to the human institution of the church. I feel it is rather the company of men, whoever it might be, who are acting on behalf of humanity. Human activity is seen as divine activity. Where human actions help to implement human wholeness it is seen as the ongoingness of God's activity in the life of the world. It is my personal conviction that the activity of the resist-

---

<sup>23</sup>Jürgen Moltmann, Religion, Revolution, and the Future (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969), p. 32.

ance movement is an attempt to say no to an unjust system that calls its citizens to kill and participate in an unjust war. By so doing the resisters are trying to achieve a better society and to create a more wholesome community. They see their efforts centered not on their own self-centered narrow concerns. Rather, they see their efforts based on a world vision of humanity. They are in communion with God. Communion with God cannot be acquired by the apathetic, the indifferent or the inactive. When one is in communion with God, Pannenberg says he is actively promoting creative love.<sup>24</sup> This love is what grants fulfillment of life. We see God as the one God of all beings. He is not a respecter of persons. The love of God is not marked by favoritism toward different individuals. Rather, it embraces all of mankind and the world. This means it goes far beyond the narrow confines of national interest of individual countries. This is the vision of the resister. He sees beyond the present moment and discovers the implication of his own participation in world history. He aligns himself with the creative and redeeming powers. His actions are instilled by the spirit of God. Indeed it may be God himself who motivates the resister to build a better world community by saying no to the existing one.

Our argument is that what sometimes seems to be an accidental character of events is more a result of human activity through God's ongoing action in the world. Pannenberg points to the idea of in-

---

<sup>24</sup>Pannenberg, Theology, pp. 117-118.

spiration as a source of man's creative power.<sup>25</sup> This is part of God's relationship to the world.

We thus realize that God's action in history is a continuous process. As men respond in an ethic of love and attempt to bring about a more just society, God's action continues to be carried out. We realize the importance of human activity. Mankind must respond in particular acts to help bring about a better world. It is my conviction that the resistance movement is indeed a part of this process of God's action in history. It is calling into question the idea of national interest and presents a vision of the sovereignty of God over all the world. This gives us part of our theological basis for an understanding of the resistance movement.

## II. THE THEOLOGY OF HOPE

An earlier part of this dissertation discussed general principles for an ethic of resistance. Most of what we said has within it the implication that we are striving to build a better world and enlarge our vision of humanity. This implies a hope for the future, Jürgen Moltmann has tried to develop a theology of hope. His theology of hope emphasizes the aspect of God's promise and an openness to the future. It is his writings that have inspired this chapter. The resistance movement itself has at the base a hope for a better world. Their hope is that things will get better and a just society will be-

---

25

Pannenberg, What Is Man?, p. 27.

gin to come about. By resisting the present State, their goal is to build a better and more just society. Hope in the future is our starting point for a discussion about the theological foundations for the resistance.

### Identity

The churches are in a crisis of identity. They do not really know who they are. Much more important they lack a distinct vision of what they should be doing. Moltmann sums this up by saying:

The new revolutionary situation has brought Christianity into a deep crisis of identity. Christians and the churches will rediscover their true self-consciousness only if they overcome their own religious alienation and their own hindrance to the free self-realization of man.<sup>26</sup>

The truth of this statement overwhelms most of us. Perhaps at no other time in man's history has he been so alienated in his understanding of God. It may be because of the secularism that is developing. Man sees himself as the ultimate in creation. Man feels that he is in control of the universe. His science has become his god. He no longer sees importance in the God of the Judeo-Christian tradition. Modern man has lost the vision of the New Testament's understanding of man's self-realization. Man's self-realization needs to be seen in response to the God who acted in Jesus Christ. Modern man needs to see the vision of self-realization that was present in Jesus as he responded to God. If the Christians within the churches could grasp the meaning of their lives in relationship to the God of the universe, then surely we would

---

<sup>26</sup> Moltmann, op. cit., p. 132.

see a reawakening. This hope is the basis of our quest. It is to free man to see the hope in the future.

Basic to Moltmann's thought is the realization that Christian hope does not make man a stranger to the world.<sup>27</sup> It does not see him as otherworldly. Instead Moltmann sees him sensitive and alert for the future. This is the presupposition of our whole first section on ethics. The Christian must be faithful to this earth because the cross stood on it. He must concern himself with the present reality and focus on a vision of the future. The committed Christian must await from God the future of this earth. This future includes all the dying and guilty human beings on the earth. This future means the Christian moves into conflict with the present aspects of human and earthly life. This is to be as a creative tension. It is the tension that exists between what the Christians believe, see and experience, while they still persevere in patience and obedience.

This means we live in a transitory history. The new future is seen as waves of anticipation. Moltmann says: "It appears first in the mission of the Christ of God, who personally incarnates the future of freedom among the unfree and in his resurrection opens up the future to everything which is dying."<sup>28</sup> The mission of the Gospel is seen in light of the hoped for future. Moltmann formulates this to mean the sinner is forgiven, the godless are justified and the humiliated are given hope.<sup>29</sup> The new future comes in as the mission of the community

---

<sup>27</sup>

Ibid., p. 119.

<sup>28</sup>

Ibid., p. 137.

<sup>29</sup>

Ibid.

of Christ. The new people of God are drawn from all nations and all people. They are the vanguard of the new humanity. They are seen as the representative embodiment of freedom from the present coercive powers of this world. The future arrives through acts of the obedience of those who believe. Moltmann gives an understanding of the people of God.<sup>30</sup> The 'new people of God' are people from ordinary life who will no longer comply to the scheme of this world, rather they anticipate the coming freedom. It comes also in the "New heaven and the new earth" where justice dwells. Christ's presence is seen as destroying the religious myths and powers and it frees the earth from meaningless death, sorrow, and pain.

As man becomes a historical being his identity becomes more and more important. The nature of man's historical being was discussed in the last section on Pannenberg. It needs to be said in this section that man becomes more of a historical being only in connection with the social changes of world history. This then becomes an agonizing and impelling identity problem. It surely means that persons and groups of men can find their identity in history. It cannot be found outside of history. They can find their identity only as they identify with concrete historical projects. Concrete historical projects allow them to see their relationship to changing the world and making it more just. Moltmann feels projects that give them identity with their God are the projects that direct themselves in overcoming human misery and

---

30

Ibid., p. 138.



enslavement.<sup>31</sup> This involvement gives them a sense of purpose. There is a certain strangeness in all of this best summed up in a quote by Moltmann:

Christians will be strange birds in the revolution. Perhaps they are something like the fools of revolution. They are deeply committed to it but also laugh about it and thus appear strange. They are deeply committed to it and laugh about it because they are the forerunners of a yet greater revolution, in which God will abolish even greater oppositions than any human revolution can envision. Any world-transforming act of justice, where it succeeds, corresponds to God's justice on earth. Nevertheless, it always needs to be referred forward to God's overcoming of this world in which even the best is still not 'very good.'<sup>32</sup>

I suppose in all of this we are saying we are searching for a future in which we can really hope. Moltmann suggests that a vision of the future is what can inspire us to act now. It is the vision of this future that gives meaning to present suffering. It is also this future hope that gives us joy in the present. All generations have realized that changes take place and will continue to take place. But perhaps this generation realizes it in a new dimension. This generation, perhaps more radically than the earlier generations, realizes that we live in a history where "everything changes and nothing remains in its place."<sup>33</sup> We might say we live between the times and are now aware of it. We could state it another way by saying: "The old times are gone and the new have not yet begun." There is much truth to this realization. This is what gives identity to the identity question for the Christian who strives to live his life in the present. He must exist in the vacuum and tension between what is now, what will be and what is

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., p. 101.      <sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 146.      <sup>33</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

yet to come after that. The man who has that vision of history and understanding of the future recognizes his destiny and his place in the world.

When this vision is present it is seen as a great challenge to help bring about the new future. This vision does not become a threat or a problem rather it becomes a stimulus to act. This hope is related to promise and fulfillment because of the faith that God will continue to fulfill his promise of salvation. The eschatological consciousness provides the new orientation to life and to the world. The Christian does not respond with despair rather his vision of hope and promise give him a new understanding of the purpose of his life.

#### To Transform

What we have said so far means we transform faith from being delivered from the world to a desire for the world. Moltmann identifies faith as that which transforms our lives to initiate changes in the world. Those who make the affirmation of faith in the future become witnesses in the world for that task. They exist in the repressive society of an unredeemed world and they become witnesses to God's righteousness and freedom. They are witnesses to society. They are also political witnesses to the government in an attempt to change or transform. "In this conception, faith comes to historical self-consciousness and to the recognition of its eschatological task within history."<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 93.

Moltmann relates this vision to promise and fulfillment.<sup>35</sup>

This is to say that our vision of the future is not to be sought in a future end of world history. It is rather to be sought in all particular moments and parts of history. It is an ongoing process. It is to be seen in the individuals awareness to be important even in the face of death. This means that history is not looked upon according to its actual developments and tendencies. Instead we must view history according to its possibilities of existence that have always been a part of it from the beginning but perhaps not fully realized.

### The Future Possibility

We have stated that the church needs to identify itself with its goals and purposes. The identity of the Christian can be seen only in his relationship to an awareness of the calling of God on the individual's life. The Christian's identity problem is centered in on the concept of how he may be used as a vessel of God to transform society to the vision of a greater and a new humanity.

Moltmann is convinced Christianity has a future if it can participate in the vision of a new hope. If it is to have a future it must bear witness to the future society that God has prepared for it. This is a future in which God is very much present. It is also seen as a future that has an abundant, upright, sovereign and purposeful humanity.<sup>36</sup> This means that in many ways we live in a revolutionary situ-

---

<sup>35</sup>

Ibid., p. 89.

<sup>36</sup>

Ibid., p. 128.

ation. In Moltmann's chapter, "God in Revolution," he states: "In the future we shall experience history more and more as revolution. We can be responsible for the future of man only in a revolutionary way."<sup>37</sup> This is the same way Pannenberg identifies God's ongoing action in history as we shall discover in the next chapter. Moltmann understands revolution to mean a transformation in the foundations of society. It may include political, economic, morality or religion. Anything less than a complete transformation is understood as evolution or reform. "But transformation in the foundations of a system becomes a genuine possibility only when previously unsuspected possibilities or powers are at hand."<sup>38</sup> This means we must compare what already is with what might be. We notice a large discrepancy between the actual and the possible. This vision of humanity sees a great potential of unrealized possibilities. Moltmann thinks science, thechnology and education make new possibilities seem attainable, yet at the same time political reasoning seems to fail to grow at the same rate. This means that the two come into serious conflict. It means that we realize the world can be changed and that nothing has to remain as it has been in the past.

Pannenberg sheds some light on how we formulate our action. He feels we must look at the ethic and the direction that is present in the message of Jesus. According to Pannenberg, "He suggests that the creative power of the future is conceivable only if we understand its

---

<sup>37</sup>

Ibid., p. 130.

<sup>38</sup>

Ibid., p.131.

actuality in terms of love."<sup>39</sup> God's loving concern for man is seen in God's attempt to allow man to participate in the creation of the new order.<sup>40</sup> It means that even though man does make mistakes there is still the possibility that a new future can emerge in spite of man's failing. This is the meaning of God's love for his creation and for the world. Love is seen as the possibility of forgiveness and realizing that one may go on in spite of shortcomings and failures. Central to the message of Jesus is the implication that in spite of what man has done in the past, he is forgiven and he may go forward into history as a forgiven man. This allows man to continuously participate in God's activity as a force of love. This is central to my understanding of the resistance. It means in spite of what the State has done, man is forgiven and a new possibility of justice may still come about. That is central to the task of the resistance movement. It calls into judgment the action of the State and makes a witness against it for the sake of God's redeeming future possibility for the world.

It is a mistake for a person to orient himself in history by orienting himself to history. Moltmann uses the illustration that he is like a shipwrecked sailor that clings to a wave, he can do nothing

---

<sup>39</sup>Pannenberg, Theology, p. 64.<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 65.

but sink.<sup>41</sup> The crucial question becomes one of asking us if the future can hold before us an orientation in history. It means that in spite of all that happens in the present historical situation we must still make a "leap of faith" when we see the vision of what might yet be. The hope of the future becomes our orientation. We realize the past can not provide the orientation. We see it only in what yet may become a reality. Our faith in the present helps us to strive for the future.

Moltmann's theology of hope helps us to view the future so we can see the emergence of a new creation from God. Because of this expectation we can and must actively try to change the present. This enables our world to become transformed into an awareness of the world of God. Our sinful humanity is seen as the humanity before God.<sup>42</sup>

Creation therefore is not closed. It is a continuous creation of what might yet be. Moltmann tells us we must realize it is continuous in two directions.<sup>43</sup> The first is that it is possible for its own self destruction. Our age lives in the frustration and realization that this may happen because of a freak of nature or the mistake of the individual who by intention or even by accident may push the button that ends up destroying all of us. The second is the idea of a redemption in a new creation. It means it may be possible to transform society, individuals and the nations, to an understanding that we

---

<sup>41</sup> Moltmann, op. cit., p. 27.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 60. <sup>43</sup> Ibid., pp. 35-36,

may one day live in justice and peace. We then view the world not as in a state of perfection but with the understanding that it may become perfectable. The world is seen as good. At the same time we cannot ignore the fact that it may become much worse than we presently imagine it. This also means that it may indeed become much better than we now see it. The world cannot now be seen as existing in a golden state of affairs. When we say that creation is open it means we realize the possibility of laying a foundation for the inauguration of a new and better history that has not yet been conceived. The process begins. We view the world as an experimental field. Constructive possibilities exist side by side with the possibilities of ultimate destruction. Or as Moltmann himself put it: "Therefore, in the midst of the open experimental field of history, the future, as understood by the Christian faith attains predominance over the past and hope enjoys ascendancy over anxiety."<sup>44</sup>

This means that we must take responsibility for man's future in a new way. It means when a man gets the insight of what it is he should be doing, he must stand up for his convictions. This is precisely what many young Americans in the Resistance are doing. They have the vision of what is possible. This vision is in conflict with the present order of things and they are saying "no" to the State as an attempt to bring about the vision of a better existence. Resistance people are involved in a contemporary search for truth. As they find

---

<sup>44</sup>

Ibid., p. 37.

that truth they come more and more to the realization that war cannot help to bring it about. Therefore they choose to stand up against the existing establishment and challenge its actions. They are aware it can be changed. They realize we do not need to keep moving in the same direction that we have been going.

This means action in the present. The goal of this action is to help bring about a more fully realized humanity. The transitional period is seen as extremely important. If we push to bring about the new vision, we have to act in accordance with the new vision. It means the tactics that are used must be formulated from the same reference point. During the transitional period, we must attempt to make life humane. Moltmann's conviction is that if we are hoping for peace and freedom to be part of the new vision they must be present in our actions.<sup>45</sup> That is to say the desire for peace and freedom must be demonstrated by practicing peace and freedom in the here and now. But perhaps it needs to be done with a great deal more determination. Moltmann states it in this way: "The meaning of a historical phenomenon for one's own existence in the present, then, would be a prolepsis of its meaning in its own future at the end of history."<sup>46</sup> The future possibility then must be a vision and at the same time it needs to be proven as a reality in the present. Those who have the vision must live their lives in accordance with their hope. It is only in this hope that anyone can have the courage to say their efforts are

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 144.<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 92.



doing something worthwhile. This type of commitment is what will build a better world. The promise that we have from the Biblical heritage is what enables us to continue this faith stance.

### Individual Involvement

We are saying the world, at least in part, lies in the hands of those who have the vision of a future hope. We find ourselves in agony about what to do. Many experiences leave us in moments of darkness where we are unable to perceive what our best actions might be. At certain moments we suddenly receive a flash of insight that pushes us into a realization of the open future. We suddenly realize that what is now is not necessarily what has to be. Moltmann states it this way: "In 'boundless amazement' and in the shape of the 'unconstructable, absolute question,' the eschaton flashes upon us suddenly and in a 'trice!'"<sup>47</sup> Each moment is seen to contain the possibility for the ultimate hope of the world. We move forward in history with this insight knowing that we have no other choice because of what we have suddenly realized. This is the importance of our earlier discussion about the importance of individual judgment. You will recall we stated it may be seen intuitively or put another way it becomes self-evident. The vision of hope combined with the possibility for action forces us to use our every effort to bring about a more just society.

---

<sup>47</sup>

Ibid., p. 155.

This is where a real alternative is seen. We can look at the historical fact in itself. Or we can realize the historical event for me. Moltmann challenges us to realize that both the historical fact and one's own historical activity are seen in relation to an open future.<sup>48</sup> This means that each phenomenon is seen in terms of its future. Each act then shows itself for what it really is. The real question is, will it add to the humanization of man? If so what then is my involvement in the situation. This means that one's own present is also related to the future, it must be accepted with responsibility.

Moltmann informs us that it is at this point when we realize the significance of the "language of history."<sup>49</sup> We become part of it. History is not something that is apart from or different from my life style. Rather it is seen as my participation in the world as I attempt to make history. The one who realizes the importance of his own conduct has no choice but to participate in history. He does this in response to the insight that he receives. He then accepts responsibility for the future. He realizes the importance of his own conduct and his response to each historical moment. He has the realization that his involvement may indeed make the difference for the way the future unfolds itself. Saying this may not be enough to combat the utter frustration that prevails today. Many people feel that no matter what we do the powers that be do not respond. There is a sense of utter powerlessness with regard to our destiny that is pervasive today.

---

<sup>48</sup>

Ibid., pp. 90-91.

<sup>49</sup>

Ibid., p. 91.

Many people may view what I say as insignificant. Yet I have to make the affirmations that our involvement may make the difference in the future of the world. We either give up or we keep trying to make the world better.

Hope then, according to Moltmann, means the world is unfinished.<sup>50</sup> It also means that the self is not yet finished. Both of these go hand in hand together. There are things that need to be done in the world. The self begins to discover its true meaning as it begins to participate in the process of completing the outside world. Both are in a process of completion. If we see hope as a religious vision it means we realize the process character of man and the world. Both are seen in light of the present participation to activity and conduct in the world.

This means that the Christian hope for the world is not seen as the process of waiting for death and then have the soul journey into heaven. Instead the Christian must see this world as demanding his concern and attention. It becomes the battleground for obtaining freedom. Hope for the Christian does not mean ignoring the present and dreaming about the future. This does not mean because the present is lacking in justice and freedom we spend our time dreaming about a better future yet to come. The Christian must instead view the present sufferings and misery as a stimulus for the hoped for future. The individual must use his creative powers to change the present miseries.

---

<sup>50</sup>

Ibid., p. 151.

We must use criticism and protest. At the same time our minds must be thinking about new ways to participate in action. In this way we can help to realize our own hopes for freedom for the future. This means that man is responsible for the present. The Christian can not stand idly by and watch the world destroy itself by perpetuating the myths of national interest at the cost of the rest of the developing nations of the world. It requires radical obedience to the God who demands that we help to alleviate existing structures that repress individuals and oppress humanity. The creative minds that have been given to man are surely capable of dreaming to formulate new possibilities of a more dignified humanity in the present. The Christian realizes the context of present society. He needs to become aware of the difficulties that present society has. When his dream and vision can be formulated in specific concrete historical actions then he is accomplishing something. We need to energise and mobilize human action to change the present world problems. Man must understand the way society is run, how decisions are made and how he can significantly have an impact in attempting to change society. The committed Christian, according to Moltmann, is described as a searching man.<sup>51</sup> The searching man is one who wants a faith that does something for him. This faith must be a free response that is united with the concept of hope in the future. The demand is made upon the individual to become responsible for his own dimension of personal morality. For many Christians they have seen

---

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 140.

the church representing a narrow picture of the heavenly Christ that has been portrayed in the word, sacrament and the institutional church. Instead many Christians today are seeking the Crucified Christ who waits among the hungry, the naked, the prisoner, and the refugee.

Part of this theological foundation for a discussion about the resistance must contain in it a theology of hope. It means that the motivation for the present acts of resistance are done only in light of the hope that a better world will be created because of the courage at the present moment. The resister must see his acts in this light. He must view his present form of dissent as an attempt to call the present social order of society into question. By so doing, it may then bring about a reevaluation of the present thrust of national states as they attempt to perpetuate their own narrow concerns. It sees the world in need of a new reformation. A reformation that requires an understanding of all humanity. A reformation of the world for the sake of the world seen in its future possibility.

At the same time he must also realize that he will not be able to bring about any final structure of society that will be complete, his own efforts are not final. If he attempts to think he is capable of doing this then he is beginning to play God. It is in the hope of what is yet to come that the resister is capable of standing up against the established orders of present society. The resister indeed understands the language of history because he sees himself as not just participating in history but sees his action as creating and making history. The future will come, and the action of the resister is a

stimulation to society that things are not all as good as they might be. The creative imagination of the resister forces a clash between the actualities of what is and the possibilities of what might be. By so participating in life it means that others might also be awakened to the new realities that lie in the future possibilities.

## CHAPTER IV

## THE RESISTANCE MOVEMENT AND ITS CONTEMPORARY THRUST

Our discussion of the resistance movement and the churches response will be divided into three parts. It will briefly outline the thrust of the present movement and the direction it is taking. Then a general overview and conclusion of the movement will be presented. The final section concludes with information relating to the role and responsibility of the churches.

The material used here has been collected from several sources. Some comes from books and periodicals. Other material is from mimeograph handouts from members of the resistance movement. The final source of information has been from my personal experience with members of the resistance community.

## I. WHAT IS HAPPENING AND WHY

One hardly knows where to begin. The movement is extremely broad in society and it moves in many different directions. I do not propose to present all of the aspects in this section. I will go into detail on a few of the most significant aspects of the resistance movement.

It is not enough to describe the resistance. It must be seen in its social context and the dynamic of what is happening in contemporary society. Most of the people in the resistance have been deeply disturbed by recent historical events. They have seen their beloved lead-

ers assassinated. Riots have been taking place both in our city streets and on our college campuses. Americans have become aware of mass starvation. Members of the resistance have viewed military coups. Most of the present younger generation have seen nothing but an endless process of war. Resisters have seen people oppressed by the millions. They have heard major political candidates discuss the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons. They have had a white racist establishment revealed to them. They have also seen no serious attempt to deal with many of the problems of contemporary society. The context of the movement is summarized by a statement from Paul Gibbons:

Resistance people see these -- rightly or wrongly -- not merely as aberrations from generally accepted values and practices in our time, but as signs of the fact that many of today's values and practices themselves, and the institutions founded upon them, are dehumanizing. They destroy man's spirit as well as his body, enslaving him to law and conditions that prevent him from discovering joy and fulfillment in life.<sup>1</sup>

All of this contributes to a new self-consciousness. We have talked about this in an earlier section. Young people and resisters in general see the existing social structure and the way it degrades humanity. Side by side with this, they have a vision of a greater world that they feel can come. It is for this reason that they begin to oppose the existing order.

The resistance is not only varied in its causes. It is a movement that expands in many different groups. It includes supporters in

---

1

Paul E. Gibbons, "What about the Resistance?" Social Action, XXXV (January 1969), 37.



the Congress and in the Senate. It has drawn support from upper middle class individuals who are alienated from the present system. It draws from the poorest blacks in the ghetto. It draws from middle class as well. Support comes from the wealthiest to the poorest. It comes from the colleges and the universities. It includes the intelligensia of America and it pulls from the less knowledgeable as well. It crosses over all racial lines. It includes people from all walks of life. The long-hairs to the straights are participating in the movement. It is not fair to say that all of these people are part of the resistance. The boundaries of the resistance movement are extremely difficult to define. These examples are given to point out the large number of dissatisfied people who may be related to the resistance movement.

The actions of the resistance are also diversified. The mind of man has discovered many different techniques and methods to raise some serious questions. The movement extends in several directions. Perhaps the most common forms of resistance are the anti-war movements combined with the active forms of resistance to the draft. Nora Sue Woodstone attempts to summarize these aspects:

They violate Selective Service laws to serve the cause of peace, and they serve time. They exile themselves to call to their country as patriots, and they are called traitors. They choose exile within their country underground—to search for solutions, and are searched for. They join the Armed Forces to resist from within, and they are eased out, locked in, or worked over. In support of youth given the choice: kill in an unjust war, be imprisoned, escape to permanent exile or hide out underground; they demonstrate, counsel, destroy draft records and have slowly altered the country's attitudes and policies. For peaceably demonstrating to end the atrocity that is Vietnam, they get tear-gassed, beaten and arrested. For counseling the confused or naive, they are cunningly charged in the courts and must themselves seek counsel.

For destroying pieces of file paper, they are sentenced by a government destroying human lives. And for articulately leading the vocal majority of this nation to urge an end to the war, they are tagged 'effete snobs', 'loud, marching, foolish and subversive dissenters', or 'evil men' by the nation's leaders, who react as do evil men-by urging silence. They are youth up against the war, and, because they are, no one can silence them.<sup>2</sup>

This gives us a partial overview of the resistance movement. It is a complex interrelated phenomenon. Members of the resistance perceive the evils of our society. Many have even given up on the normal democratic process as a method of changing and therefore have resorted to acts of civil disobedience. Some of these will be expanded on. There are also some who are still deeply convinced that there is hope in the normal democratic process and still use their efforts in this direction. Basic to the movement is a radical concern for other persons. It is a person centered movement. The resistance assumes man is free to respond to the situation. It sees man as being morally responsible for his conduct.

The resistance movement has many varied forms of organization. There is no central organized body that promotes a unified approach. Individuals with a common concern usually gather together to participate in a common goal or project. Once the project has been completed the individual moves to other groups with other interests. It is a movement one becomes a part of rather than an organization to join. There are however certain groups and organizations that do carry on regular programs. Resist is such an organization. It has a monthly

---

2

Norma Sue Woodston, Up Against the War (New York: Tower, 1970), pp. 34-35.

newsletter and acts as a central location to collect and disperse money to various projects of the resistance movement.

One of the primary goals of the resistance movement is to effect a change in military manpower in our country. They have a great desire to stop United States Military supremacy. They want a change in United States foreign policy. The resisters want to move away from military intervention and control around the world. They also see the way that militarism has invaded many aspects of contemporary American democratic life. Several social critics are beginning to label our nation a militarized society. The reader is referred to the references in the bibliography for further information about this topic.<sup>3</sup> However we need to identify some of its basic aspects in order to realize its implications for the resistance.

The Center Magazine for January, 1970 has an article written by Donald McDonald titled "Militarism in America." He attempts to point out what he calls the major characteristics of a militarized society.<sup>4</sup>

---

3

For a more comprehensive coverage of the topic of Militarism and its influence on society and America, the reader is referred to any one of the following books: Richard J. Barnet, The Economy of Death (New York: Atheneum 1969); Juan Bosch, Pentagonism, A Substitute for Imperialism (New York: Grove Press 1968); Tristram Coffin, The Armed Society (Baltimore: Penguin 1964); Fred J. Cook, Donavan, Militarism U.S.A. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons 1970); John Kenneth Galbraith, How To Control the Military (New York: New American Library 1969); Ralph E. Lapp, The Weapons Culture (Baltimore: Penguin 1968); Sidney Lens, The Military-Industrial Complex (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press 1970).

4

Donald McDonald, "Militarism in America," Center Magazine, III: 1 (January 1970), 13-14.

A militarized society is an authoritarian society. Free expression is seen as a serious threat to the establishment and existing forces of power. Dissent cannot be tolerated. Disobedience and opposition to the government is met with swift repression.

Stability is a cardinal virtue in a militarized society. Social justice and human rights are sometimes altogether ignored. If they are not ignored they may be viewed with sour suspicion since they cannot be entertained without implying that stability is a vice rather than a virtue. The most important thing is that the power structure must remain stable at all costs.

The militarized society is a fearful society. The final way of justifying a militarized society is that it is surrounded by enemies. In this kind of atmosphere human trust begins to disappear. Paranoia becomes a national disease. One must continue to build up more and more weapons in order to feel safe from the enemy.

The militarized society is a self-righteous society. It thinks that its motives are purest. No one can question its values or surpass its ideals. When war is waged it does so to protect these qualities. It does not view itself as being able to make any mistakes or wrong judgments.

The military is not a means to an end, it is an end in itself in a militarized society. This means whatever is good for the military is good for the society. Military logic becomes the national philosophy. No one questions the implications of their power in the decision making processes of society.

A militarized society gives to the military the highest priority

in claims on the national resources. The lion's share of the government revenues from taxes on the people is consumed by the military. A large part of what is left over is used to placate the restless people and to repress those they are not able to placate.

A militarized society has an unchallengeable claim on the lives of its young men. Conscription into military service becomes natural. No one questions it. It almost becomes unnotices. It is seen as part of the political and social landscape.

In a militarized society, the military are beyond effective criticism and control. Criticism can normally come from legislative bodies, courts, the press, universities, churches and other such groups. In a militarized society these groups are either ignored or they are silenced.

A militarized society perceives most political problems as military problems and the militarized solution is therefore the only realistic solution. They also perceive most international problems and some or many domestic problems as belonging in their control. The military determines and defines the options confronting a society. Civilian policy makers who want to consider options other than those advocated by the military do so at the risk of being labeled 'soft-headed' or disloyal.

The economy is dependent on the military in a militarized society. The single biggest industry is the military. Its disolution would be an end to the nation. There would be nothing left if it were gone.

The militarized society is a sterile society. It turns human

and material resources into instruments of death. It neglects the problems that are concerned with the quality of life. It suppresses or buys off divergent views and choices. The militarized society deprives itself of the artists and philosophers, the critics and the saints, the idealism of youth and the wisdom and experience of its elders. This results in a sterility, emptiness, and barrenness.

The militarized society is a barbaric society. This does not mean that the barbarian is covered with blood or even in military uniform. In a technological society decent people are able to perform tasks at drawing boards that cause the death of hundreds of thousands of people around the world. Entire populations may be involved in this. The killing process can be completed without even seeing the faces of those who are killed. This inevitably makes one indifferent about the taking of human life. The militarization simply makes it easier and less painful to bring about the indifference.

We see the implications of what this does to society. The resistance movement is dedicated to try to overcome militarism. Resisters want to destroy any tendency toward militarism.

Some of the ways this is done will be reviewed. I have selected what I believe to be the major areas of concern. I will discuss the following aspects: Destruction of draft cards; Destroying files in mass; Emigration and exile; Refusal of induction and prison; Reform within the military; Other aspects. Some of these aspects realize a more revolutionary nature than others. A basic concern of people involved in the movement is a desire to overcome the problems of United States military involvement.

### Destruction of Draft Cards

Draft cards have been burned since the beginning of World War II. People paid little attention to it back then. It has become a significant aspect of the present movement. Draft card burning started with David Miller at the Whitehall Street Induction Center in Manhattan. An anti-war rally was held there on October 15, 1966. David Miller stood up and said that actions speak louder than words, he then proceeded to burn his draft card. The next morning it was front page news throughout the world.

During the following months many more draft cards were burned, mutilated or destroyed. 1966 was the year that saw many conferences spring up across the country to discuss the draft resistance. Attempts were made to help support the families of the resisters who paid the price of jail. The symbol of the movement was to get rid of one's draft card. This was not done in private. The destruction of the draft cards was made a public event. Public celebrations of freedom and life were held. They made clear their motivations. They were going to close down the Selective Service System and thus help to end the war in Vietnam. Soon the movement began to snowball.

April 15, 1967 was one of the most important days in the early history of the movement. It was the first massive draft card turn in and burning ceremony to be held. There were nearly 500 persons who publicly refused to any longer hold their membership cards of Selective Service. The movement grew even larger. October 16th saw 1,400 more people relinquish their draft cards in some 30 different cities across

the country. Another 600 were turned in within the next two months. These young Americans were saying they were no longer willing to carry the card.

The draft card burning was not an end in itself. It was really the beginning for many. Michael Ferber put it this way:

Turning in one's draft card and refusing to cooperate with the Selective Service was the beginning--the first large and perhaps existentially crucial act--but only the first act in a whole way of life, in the construction of a whole movement that would be different from the other student and left movements that had previously existed in America.<sup>5</sup>

It was also a way of expressing that young people were no longer afraid of the system. Fear of what might happen was no longer significant for the man of conscience who felt he could no longer remain silent.

This is stated by David Harris:

What that draft card has taught people from day to day in their lives is how consistently to live under the auspices of fear...If we were to dispense with words like "left" and "right" then what you and I can say in the world today is that we live in the unanimous organized politics of fear . . . What you and I can reasonably do, then, is not to say that we won't be afraid, because I've never met a man who wasn't afraid. What you and I can say is that we refuse to make that fear the central fact of our lives.<sup>6</sup>

The self-conscious movement then really began with that massive draft card turn in on April 15, 1967. Before this time it was composed of scattered individuals who were obeying the dictates of their consciences. There had been isolated and lonely acts of individuals who

---

5

Daniel Berrigan, et. al., Delivered Into Resistance (New Haven: Advocate Press 1969), pp. 6-7.

6

Ibid., p. 7.



stood up and protested alone. Two new dimensions were added with the April 15 happening. The first was a new sense of corporate effort and support. They knew they were not alone. A movement with strong support was behind them. It was a collective community of deep commitment, and they were willing to put their lives on the line. Secondly, they viewed their acts as something more than just a personal break with the system. Many saw themselves playing a symbolic and prophetic function.<sup>7</sup> They thought they might be able to wake up a sleeping society. They saw themselves responsible for the future and they were going to try to gain control of a new thrust.

The impact of this aspect of resistance has been felt far and wide. It has challenged many families because a son has chosen to break the law. Many churches have had to face up to the questions when one of its young members wants to make his intentions known to the congregation.

#### Destroying Draft Files In Mass

Another significant aspect of the resistance is the destruction of draft files in Selective Service offices and at induction centers. This movement started in October of 1967 with "the Baltimore Four." The group was composed of Father Philip Berrigan, Tom Lewis, David Eberhardt, and Reverend James Mengel. They entered a draft board in Baltimore, Maryland. Blood was poored on draft files to symbolize the

---

7

Gibbons, op. cit., p. 33.

blood that had been spilled in Vietnam. The blood was also used to symbolize a religious meaning. Blood was used as an act of purification in the Old Testament. It was brought to fruition in Christ with the last supper. This was the first act against a collection of draft files. It has been repeated in many different forms since October of 1967.

The two most publicized incidents were "The Catonsville Nine" and "The Milwaukee Fourteen." Both of these groups issued statements about their actions and performed the act openly. They did not try to hide. They wanted their act to be seen by the public. Their desire was to raise the issue of the Selective Service System. These two statements appear in the appendix. Appendix A contains the Cantonsville statement. Appendix B has the Milwaukee statement. The reader is referred to them.

Seven men and two women entered Local Board Number 33 in Cantonsville, Maryland on May 17, 1968. Cantonsville is a small community just outside of Baltimore, Maryland. These nine people gathered some 400 class I-A files from the Local Board. They placed them in waste baskets and took them outside to a parking lot. They emptied the waste baskets on the ground. Then they proceeded to burn them with home-made napalm. Napalm was used to symbolize the way it has been used to destroy many people in Vietnam.

This same act was repeated again in another state. This time it was in Wisconsin. On September 24, 1968 fourteen men entered a Local Board in Milwaukee. They proceeded to gather together some 10,000 I-A draft files. They removed these files to a nearby square that had been

dedicated to America's war dead. These files were burned with home-made napalm.

These acts were indeed dramatic anti-war and anti-draft actions. There are many people who saw these acts representing a dramatic prophetic act of non-violence. These acts became of great significance for the anti-war movement. The participants of these acts moved on the conviction that some property has no right to exist. They felt this was true of draft files. They are sincere in this belief and they were willing to place their lives on the line to act out their commitment. They did not do it behind closed doors or try to run away. They did it in the open and they made their concerns known to anyone who would take the time to listen.

This was just the beginning of this form of protest. It has occurred many times since. It is difficult to keep track of the many places that it has occurred. Some times it has been done at induction centers as in Los Angeles in the spring of 1969. This was when three men entered the induction center downtown Los Angeles and removed and destroyed a large number of files of men who were to be inducted that day. Some have not been so daring in their acts and have destroyed draft files without revealing their own identity. The resistance movement still continues in this direction.

### Emigration and Exile

Many Americans choose to resist by emigrating to another country. Some make no attempt at all to change the present system. They simply give up and leave. Others try to work through the system and

exhaust their administrative remedies before leaving. They try to do everything within their power to keep from going into the service or to Vietnam. When they discover that the only alternative they have to going is to go to prison, they then decide to leave the country. One example of this is Michael E. Lundholm. A letter explaining his actions is found in Appendix C.

This part of the movement is so widespread there is a great deal of material available to those who are considering emigration.<sup>8</sup> There is an extremely active movement in Canada to help support the resisters and the deserters. The deserters attempt to set up a new life elsewhere in another country.

Who are the deserters and why do they split to another country?

Norma Sue Woodstone sums up some of the reasons:

- the guy who believes in capitalism, armies, even in the draft, but who "just couldn't bear the idea of going to Vietnam and fighting, maybe dying, in an unjust war.
- the non-believer; "North America is a declining society. I find an incredible ignorance on the part of the government and most of the people. There's a lot of ideology but no one ever seems to get around to the point that war costs lives and that people are being killed.
- the full-fledged pacifist: "I wouldn't fight to protect my country or family. I don't want to kill anyone and if they want to kill me, that's their problem.
- the late-flowering pacifist: "I adjusted to everything pretty well: good grades in school...on my way to a business career. I even adjusted to the Army until that day in basic training when the instructor showed us how an M-14 bullet can split a pine tree in

---

8

Two manuals are available on this subject: Daniel Finnerty and Charles Funnell, Exiled, Handbook for the Draft Age Emigrant (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Resistance, 1968); Byron Wall (ed.) Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada (Toronto: House of Anasi, 1970).

half and kill the man standing behind the tree. I couldn't adjust to that. So after much thought, I adjusted myself onto a plane for Sweden."

--the last minute deserter: a cleancut youth who refused to go to Vietnam and was ordered by his Fort Ord, California, superiors to be sent under guard, in handcuffs, to defend freedom in Vietnam. His parents financed his flight to freedom in Sweden.

--the old switcheroo: Dennis Dunn was serving in Germany when three men from his unit were caught deserting. Assigned to guard one of them, Dunn talked to him frequently and concluded he was an OK-guy but had been brainwashed by the Commies. The OK-guy got five years. Then, reports an underground newspaper, Dunn met some Vietnam veterans, whom he found inhuman, in fact, vicious folk. Dunn began to wonder who was brainwashed. When he put it all together, he split.<sup>9</sup>

These are illustrations of military men who have split the scene.

Their reasons are similar to those civilians who leave when they are confronted with the same question. The motives of the emigrant or deserter arise from many different reasons. It may be for moral, political or even for religious opposition that they make the decision to depart.

#### Refusal of Induction and Prison

The reasons that many young Americans make a decision to refuse induction or go to prison are similar to the reasons for emigration, but with one main difference. They decide to stay to try to change the system. They feel that the witness they make by going to prison will help to bring about a change in society. One of the old mottoes that was commonly heard was "Fill the prisons and they will have to listen to us."

---

9

Woodstone, op. cit., pp. 83-84.

They feel that the sacrifice of two or three years of their life is nothing compared to the sacrifice they would have to make to oppose the dictates of their conscience or the sacrifice of the Vietnamese. They have hope in the system and think that it can work. A recent psychological study was made on war objectors who are serving prison terms.<sup>10</sup> One of the surprising things that comes out of this book is that the man who chooses prison has some serious changes that occur to him while pursuing prison life. Their commitment begins to dwindle and their motivation starts to weaken. They then begin to wonder if they really did the right thing. Not all people agree with the conclusions of Gallin but it is undoubtedly true of many. David Harris is an example of where just the opposite thing happens. His prison experience has deepened his commitment and broadened his interest in changing society. This prompted him to write a book about his future goals.<sup>11</sup> An anthology of prison life has been prepared by the Chicago Area Draft Resisters. This points out how prison life has effected some members of the movement.<sup>12</sup> An example of the reasoning that is used by some who refuse to comply to an order for induction into the armed forces can be found in Appendix D.

---

10

Willard Gaylin, In the Service of Their Country (New York: Viking Press, 1970).

11

David Harris, Goliath (New York: Avon, 1970).

12

"Behind Bars, A. Prison Anthology" (Mimeographed by Chicago Area Draft Resisters, December 5, 1968).

### Reform within the Military

The arms of the resistance have extended beyond just civilian aspects. It has permeated the very structures of the military establishment. It is seen in several different directions. We have already discussed the exiles, those who desert. This is a large number of personnel. But it is difficult to know exactly how large the movement is because the Pentagon tries to make it sound more insignificant than it really is. Suffice it to say that it is a large enough unit so that its impact is being felt. At one time during the upsurge of the Vietnam war it was estimated that there were as many as 200-300 soldiers who were deserting every day from California alone. This figure is large simply because California is the last stopping-off point for soldiers before they are sent overseas to Vietnam.

However, there is equally important another movement within the military. This is the movement that is attempting to try to reform the structure from within. This movement extends in several directions. There are any number of small groups and organizations that fall under the general heading of "G.I.'s Opposed to the War." The activities of these groups are normally quite minimal. It consists largely of small rallies and short term protests. They focus on confronting other soldiers with the reality of their willingness to participate in the conflict in Southeast Asia. Much discussion of this nature takes place in the coffee houses that are located near air bases around the country. The impact of this is felt.

One of the other more important aspects comes from those pushing

for reform. There are two extremely significant groups at work. The first is the Movement for A Democratic Military, commonly referred to as the MDM. It strives to raise the questions of military authority. It wants to see the military become more democratic in its administration. It would allow for the lower ranks of military life to have more choice in determining the events that effect their future. This movement is quite decentralized and lacks in its organization. It pops up around the country where ever there are individuals who have the interest. There is little continuity from one base to the next. Because of this it is difficult to change the structure in any significant way.

The second of the movements is the Concerned Officers' Movement, commonly known as COM. It receives its leadership from among the officer ranks. Their intention is closely related to the goals of the MDM. They want to see a new style of life in the military. They see their responsibility for society and not just for the military establishment. Many of them have seen a new understanding of their oath. They swore they would uphold the constitution of the United States. They see the military establishment going against the constitution and they feel that they must therefore speak out against it. They have taken an oath of allegiance to support the constitution, now they see that this oath requires them to oppose the existing military order.

COM was started back in Washington, D.C., in November of 1969. I had the honor of meeting and talking with one of its organizers, Randy Thomas. I was impressed with his commitment and his understand-



ing of the opposition and resistance movement. It awakened my mind to the possibilities of reform that might take place within the military itself if it gets the right people in their striving to change it. The problem is that Randy Thomas was granted an early resignation from his military career. He was a threat to the military so they wanted him out. This is what happens to many members in the movement. I have included a section in the Appendix stating their general policy. This is found in Appendix E.

### Other Aspects

The resistance movement extends in other directions beyond what have been discussed here. It also includes a vast underground movement that helps AWOL's, UA's and others to remain hidden from the establishment. It permeates all ranks of society. Many wealthy upper-middle class suburban people are involved in this way. They give housing, food and shelter for a few days while someone is trying to get their head together about what they feel they will do. They contribute money to the families of those who are in prison because of their consciences. They help furnish transportation for those who desire to emigrate to another country. They counsel and help the individuals decide what their options are. The underground plays an extremely important role in protecting people from the authorities when they are trying to determine their future.

Many thousands of Americans of all ages and backgrounds have signed statements of complicity. These statements declare their own guilt along with those who are tried for resisting the established

order. They state that they too would refuse to comply with orders to go into the service to become part of the military establishment.

The Moratorium should also be classed as a part of the resistance. Its intention was to declare "no more work as usual." Their goal was to educate the American silent majority to the realities of the conflict in Southeast Asia. The Moratorium was responsible for waking up many Americans. They helped to push for political action at the grass roots level to elect peace candidates. They raised money to support candidates who would offer a new option on election day. The efforts of this group cannot be ignored.

We could go on and on listing other aspects of the resistance movement from war tax resistance to counseling 18 year olds into refusing to register for the draft. The aspects that have been listed will give a general overview of the tremendous aspects and implications of the movement and how widespread it is.

## II. CONCLUSIONS TO BE DRAWN

The influence that the resistance movement has had on this country is overwhelming in some aspects yet extremely insignificant in other ways. That it permeates many aspects of society cannot be denied. This is true because of family involvement and also because of press coverage. Its impact has been felt. Yet in many ways it has not had the impact that the participants would have liked. Their motto was that if we could fill the prisons that would force the establishment-government to change its policies. This has happened to some extent. There has been a slow and gradual withdrawal from Southeast Asia. For

the participants in the resistance movement this has been far too slow. A withdrawal of our military involvement in Southeast Asia is not occurring as fast as they would wish. But there is no denying that the resistance has and is continuing to leave its mark on government policy. Many congressional leaders have spoken out against the war because of the varied opposition that has emerged from the general populace of the country and from the resistance movement.

When one reads through the Appendixes you can not help but be struck by the depth of sincerity and commitment that is present in the statements. Their intense desire to build a better world becomes obvious to the reader. They have a vision that cannot be destroyed. They have an understanding of the problems of United States foreign policy and they realize our policy needs to be changed.

Our earlier section on ethics pointed out the responsibility of individuals for their own moral conduct. We stated then that legal obligations found their roots in the social nature of man. The resistance sees man in his social nature. The resistance sees man existing in a worldwide community. The resister is able to see beyond his own narrow self-centered interests. This is obvious over and over again when you read the statements in the Appendix. A number of the resisters point out the need to change the life style in America. We can no longer be content to exist in great wealth and affluence at the expense of many of the developing nations around the world. We have no right to drain the developing nations of their natural resources to supply our desire for materialism. Indeed the resister sees clearly the responsibility for understanding man in his social nature. It is not

a social nature based on the narrow interests of nationalism. The prophetic voice of the resistance raises a loud voice of protest about this.

The resister realizes that social life is pluralistic. Colonialism and imperialism have existed long enough. Other societies must be allowed to exist and have their own cultural values. The Western Protestant ethic has no right to try to get the rest of the world to conform to its vision of the nature of man. The resister also realizes that not all men can take the same position that he is expressing. Many of them respect the right of individual conscience. They do however seriously question whether the information that most Americans have is truthful enough to allow them to realize the problem. There are some among the resistance movement that are dogmatic and demand that all conscientious citizens do exactly the same thing that they are doing. Many of them on the other hand are willing to work with the process of getting out information and educating people about the situation. They feel by doing this they will then realize the need to change foreign policy.

The resisters realize their obligation to humanity. They participate in acts of protest and resistance for this purpose. They feel their obligation to humanity is for them to stand up and say no to the present system. The majority of the resisters act out of a concern for the social order and not just the dictates of their own individual consciences. Though it is from the motivation of their individual consciences that they act out their commitment on behalf of humanity. Man must say no to the war machine if he is to survive in

the twentieth century.

Many of the resisters have thought through their claims and positions consistently. They have studied and acquired the information that is needed to make a conscientious decision. They are not on their own private ego trip. The international scene has been considered. They are aware of options that are open to them. Their actions are thought through with great depth. Many of them respond from pure motives to change the present thrust of events in history.

Parts of the resistance movement have been open in their actions. They participate in acts of civil disobedience so that all can see what they are doing. This has been done in two ways. Many of them have responded in overt acts of destruction in the presence of witnesses. The acts are done openly in order to publicize the movement. They are not trying to hide anything. Instead they are convinced that by acting in the open it will awaken more citizens to the reality of the existing situations. A second way this has been done is through the distribution of literature. Many resisters have written and published pamphlets and booklets on their motivation and intention. This enables them to engage in dialogue with their opposition. They want others to know why they are acting. They make their motives clear. The resisters want the public to know what they are doing. This both allows them to check their own action and it also causes others to evaluate their positions.

It is not difficult to see the vision for a better world that is the basic motivation that underlies the entire resistance movement. This motivation has taken on varied forms of action. Yet all of the

action still points in the direction of trying to create a better world in which to live. Their vision of the future is clear. They are willing to give all they have to try to bring it about. Resisters by the hundreds are serving terms in prison for standing up for the convictions they hold. Thousands more have fled the country in an attempt to keep themselves from participating in the injustices. Hundreds of others are suffering persecution from within the ranks as they attempt to work within the system to change the priorities. The resisters are giving all they have.

Many resisters make no claim for identity with the Christian faith or with the God of the Judeo-Christian tradition. Others find this as their soul motivating form and it becomes their continuing inspiration. Perhaps they do represent the 'new people of God' in many different ways. If we take seriously the implications of what we said in our section about God's action in history, then we have to affirm God's continuing creation. The resistance movement may be a significant part of this.

### III. THE ROLE OF THE CHURCH

Let us now turn to a discussion of the relationship of the institutional church. What is its role in the resistance movement? The church has a significant position in social control. It has its impact on society as members conform to the teachings and the ethic of the Gospel. Many times this has been misrepresented and the church has failed in its social obligations of opposing rather than simply conforming to the existing order.

The Christian churches are going to face a continuing challenge. More and more of our young people are engaging in the activities that have been discussed in our previous analysis. As more people become involved, the church is going to be forced to furnish better answers. They will have to take on a more heroic stance if they are to meet these challenges. The Christian norm has been to rely on a silent conformity to the existing nation-state and the power that it represents. The power of the men who maintain control of the state has had little resemblance to the 'Christian Prince of Peace.' A Christian theology of conformity to the state is simply not enough. Gordon Zahn points this out when he says this is true "especially in a world which sees no inconsistency in equating security with an institutionalized threat of mutual annihilation."<sup>13</sup> This is obvious in the Christian churches in America, and elsewhere, when there is no serious voice of protest that is speaking against continuing nuclear research and testing of weapons. The church has been used as a method of social control to allow this to continue. Its members have been urged to conform to this style of life. It has represented the interest of the nation-state rather than the truth of the Gospel.

The church on the other hand is true to its vocation only when it represents the destiny of all mankind. This means it must see beyond its own nationalistic oriented interests. It must anticipate the future of all mankind. The church needs to see this as the goal of

---

13

Gordon C. Zahn, War, Conscience and Dissent (New York: Hawthorn, 1967), pp. 194-195.

history. This is what becomes the judge for the significance of the church and its relationship to the world. If the church is to be true to its vocation, it must commit itself to the goal of a universal and humanizing vocation. There is a universal vocation of the church. When it deviates from this character, the church is being deprived of its social significance.<sup>14</sup>

This means we need a vision of a political Utopia. We need a transformation of nation-states concept of foreign policy. The thrust must be converted from a nationalistic foreign policy to one of a worldwide domestic policy. Moltmann phrases it as a primary question. The primary question is not "what is good for my land and my standard of living," but "what is good for the peace of the world and the building of a coming world community?"<sup>15</sup> One must then act in accord with what he expects for the coming community. This means he will need the courage to act against the so-called justified interests of his own nation. Instead he declares solidarity with the victims of slavery, injustice and oppression that have been perpetuated because of the national policy of his own land. His commitment goes to the entire human community. It is not difficult to see that the means of military power have outgrown their justified limits. The military in many

---

<sup>14</sup>Wolfhart Pannenberg, Theology and the Kingdom of God (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), p. 74.

<sup>15</sup>Jürgen Moltmann, Religion, Revolution and the Future (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969), pp. 39-40.



ways has become more significant than human lives. It can no longer be controlled on the national level. The national level falls into the trap of narrow-mined self-interests. If this tendency continues it may well mean disaster for all men. This is the constant fear that we must all live in.

The future must be viewed in light of international interests and relations. The individual nations have become notoriously self-centered. They become special interest groups that fight to gain control of the resources of the globe to meet their own desires. No country has the right to deprive another country of its resources. Many nations of the world reflect this special interest over and above the general claims of humanity. They want the citizens of their country to have the biggest and the best at the expense of a smaller less powerful country. We ask the question then about why the desires of any nation have any greater claim on me than any other special interests of particular groups within any state.<sup>16</sup> In fact, when they come into conflict with our general concern for humanity we may indeed be obligated to disobey them in the interest of others. The vision of humanity must be seen with a worldwide perspective and not just the narrow confines of self-interest.

This has been the problem of the institutional church. It has been reduced to nothing more than an agency to channel and reinforce

---

16

Mulford Q. Sibley, The Obligation to Disobey Conscience and the Law (New York: Council on Religion and International Affairs, 1970), p. 49.

the controls of the state.<sup>17</sup> It has not been true to its world community. It has accepted the state's definition of well being. It has not challenged or called into question the narrow self-interests of the nation. The church has been turned into a puppet of the government. It has not been true to its higher calling. Some of the churches have become involved in speaking out, but generally the churches have remained silent.

One of the reasons for this is because of the self-interest of the church. It has been too concerned with its won status in society. It has not wanted to alienate itself from the existing powers. Its concern has been for its own influence and prestige in society. The churches have not rocked the boat, instead they have been driven by the forces of the waves. They have thus failed in their prophetic and judgmental task. Their concern must go beyond their own self-interests of security, influence and prestige. Rather they should be primarily concerned with the humanity of man and trying to humanize the social order.<sup>18</sup>

The church must make its voice heard. It must speak up loudly and clearly. It can not longer remain a stagnant institution in relation to international relations and the problems of war. The resistance movement has raised many serious problems that the institutional church cannot ignore. The church must evaluate its own

---

<sup>17</sup>Zahn, op. cit., p. 259.<sup>18</sup>Moltmann, op. cit., p. 120.

position and in some ways it may need to align itself with the resistance movement. There are factions within the institutional church that are already doing this. But the movement must be expanded to include more of its members. This is the time for an institutional commitment and not just an individual response.

Pannenberg points out two functions of the institutional church. One of its first tasks is to keep political organizations and its representatives from making a claim of ultimate human significance. As we have stated earlier, the state was made for man, not the man for the state. When the state claims ultimate significance it becomes idolatry. The Christian must not align himself with this. Instead he must oppose it with all the energy he has. He must not bow down and worship the state. The second function of the church he points to is to stir the imagination of the people to social action. This social action must center on witnessing for the future fulfillment of God's Kingdom. It must strive to build a better and more just social order for mankind. It cannot be happy with the present situation. Those who respond to God must strive to bring about a better social order.<sup>19</sup>

This means that the church must strive to change the world to make it a better place to live. It changes the focus to center on the importance of man in the world. The vision of a better society motivates us to act. We see the presence of inhumanities and we realize that they can be overcome. It is possible to build a better society

---

19

Pannenberg, op. cit., p. 85.

where repression and oppression are not perpetuated. Sellers has this vision:

The most representative forms of human agency are those by which mankind realizes wholeness--tenderness, community, justice and health. Human agency that represents these qualities is sacramental, representative of the divine; it is action that is not merely an appropriation but a proprium of divine action.<sup>20</sup>

This is a big task for the churches. We cannot ignore the demands that are placed upon us, by the Gospel.

The religious community plays a significant role here. It must be seen as one of the value-forming institutions of our society. Because of this, it plays an important part in changing values of individuals. The kind of dissent that is needed can be promoted and encouraged by the religious community. No other part of society can play precisely the same role. The individual will still have to be the one to "stand apart." Surely the individual will be more apt to stand apart if he has the backing of a religious body. His deviance and dissent take on the form of a rational conformity to values that are proposed by the religious community.<sup>21</sup> This rational conformity would be conformity to the vision of the Kingdom of God. When an individual is a part of a community that represents a vision of a new humanity he receives the support of a collective body. This makes it much easier for a person to stand up and act out his social witness.

---

20

James Sellers, Theological Ethics (New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 127.

21

Zahn, op. cit., p. 280.

The religious community makes it more significant because of the position that it holds in our society. People will reflect more seriously about their own conduct when they realize the motivation for action comes from such a source.

Dissent and deviance are needed today. There must be opposition to the existing social order. The kind that is needed is to have voices that will speak out against present government foreign policies. People must speak out against nuclear testing and nuclear war. People must reject the government's right to claim an inherent right to lie. There is no such right. The faithful must be encouraged to stand apart from the rest of the community and call into question the national practices that fail to meet the test of their religious community.<sup>22</sup> This is precisely what is being done by the community of the resistance. Somehow the church is not really with them in their efforts to change the status quo.

The social and political life of man is failing to provide fulfillment in history. The church will remain necessary as long as the existing social order does not change. The transcendence of God places man in the process of the eternal. The Kingdom of God promises fulfillment in human history. It remains the task of the church to help bring this about.

What then does this mean for the churches? Moltmann feels this means that Christian social action must push for the overthrow of all

---

22

Ibid., p. 281.

conditions that humiliate and enslave mankind.<sup>23</sup> The purpose of this is to enable man a fuller life. A fuller life makes a more abundant, upright, sovereign, and purposeful man.

This then gives us a working framework for understanding the resistance. It must be viewed in light of its significance for human history. There is a hope for a better future and this vision is present with the resistance movement. We cannot deny that it is a possibility that it is indeed God Himself who is working through men to bring this about.

---

<sup>23</sup>

Moltmann, op. cit., p. 122.

## **SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## A. BOOKS

- Bainton, Roland H. Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace, a Handbook Survey and Critical Re-evaluation. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Baez, Joan. Daybreak. New York: Dial Press, 1968
- Barnet, Richard J. The Economy of Death. New York: Atheneum, 1969.
- Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- Bates, Scott. Poems of War Resistance From 2300 B. C. to the Present. New York: Grossmann, 1969.
- Bedau, Hugo Adam (ed.) Civil Disobedience Theory and Practice. New York: Pegasus, 1969.
- Bennett, John C. Christian Realism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.
- Berrigan, Daniel. Love, Love at the End. New York: Macmillan, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Trial of the Catonsville Nine. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_, et al. Delivered Into Resistance. New Haven: Advocate Press, 1969.
- Berrigan, Philip. Prison Journals of a Priest Revolutionary. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- Bornkamm, Gunther. Early Christian Experience. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Bosch, Juan. Petagonism a Substitute for Imperialism. New York: Grove Press, 1968.
- Brandon, S. G. F. Jesus and the Zealots, a Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.
- Breck, Peter. Radical Pacifist in Antebellum America. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Cadoux, Cecil John. The Early Church and the World, a History of the Christian Attitude to Pagan Society and the State Down to the Time of Constantine. Edinburgh: Clark, 1955.



- Chomsky, Noam. et al. Trials of the Resistance. New York: Vintage, 1970.
- Coffin, Thristram. The Armed Society. Baltimore: Penguin, 1964.
- Cook, Fred J. The Warfare State. New York: Macmillan, 1962.
- Cullmann, Oscar. The State in the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.
- Donavan, Colonel James A. Militarism U. S. A. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.
- Douglas, James W. The Nonviolent Cross, a Theology of Revolution and Peace. New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Ellul, Jacques. The Presence of the Kingdom. New York: Seabury Press, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Theological Foundation of Law. New York: Seabury Press, 1968.
- Enslin, Morton Scott. The Ethics of Paul. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957.
- Finn, James. A Conflict of Loyalties, the Case for Selective Conscientious Objection. New York: Pegasus, 1968.
- Finnerty, Daniel, and Charles Funnell. Exiled Handbook for the Draft Age Emigrant. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Resistance, 1968.
- Fortas, Abe. Concerning Dissent and Civil Disobedience. New York: New American Library, 1968.
- Galbraith, John Kenneth. How to Control the Military. New York: New American Library, 1969.
- Gallin, Mother Mary Alice. German Resistance to...Hitler, Ethical and Religious Factors. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1968.
- Gardner, Fred. The Unlawful Concert. New York: Viking Press, 1970.
- Gaylin, Willard. In the Service of Their Country, War Resisters in Prison. New York: Viking Press, 1970.
- Gollwitzer, Helmut (ed.) Dying We Live, the Last Message of Men and Women Who Resisted Hitler and Were Martyred. New York: Seabury Press, 1956.
- Harris, David. Goliath. New York: Avon, 1970.

- Harvey, Arthur. Theory and Practice as Civil Disobedience.  
Canterbury, N.H.: 1967.
- Kierkegaard, Sren. Unscientific Postscript. Princeton: Princeton  
University Press, 1941.
- Konvitz, Milton M. Religious Liberty and Conscience, a Constitutional  
Inquiry. New York: Viking Press, 1968.
- Lapp, Ralph E. The Weapons Culture. Baltimore: Penguin, 1968.
- Lasserre, Jean. War and the Gospel. Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press,  
1962.
- Leaney, A. R. C. The Letters of Peter and Jude. Cambridge:  
Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Lens, Sidney. The Military Industrial Complex. Philadelphia:  
Pilgrim Press, 1970.
- Lewin, Leonard C. Report From Iron Mountain on the Possibility and  
Desirability of Peace. New York: Delta, 1967.
- Long, Edward LeRoy Jr. War and Conscience in America. Philadelphia:  
Westminster Press, 1968.
- Lynd, Alice. We won't Go. Personal Account of War Objectors. Boston:  
Beacon Press, 1968.
- MacGregor, G. H. C. The New Testament Basic of Pacifism and the  
Relevance of an Impossible Ideal. Nyack, N.Y.: Fellowship, 1960.
- Magdoss, Harry. The Age of Imperialism, the Economics of U. S.  
Foreign Policies. New York: Modern Reader, 1968.
- Martin, David A. Pacifism an Historical and Sociological Study.  
New York: Schocken, 1966.
- Mayer, Milton. Liberty: Man vs the State. Santa Barbara, Ca.:  
Center for the Study of the Democratic Institutions, 1969.
- Melman, Seymour. In the Name of America. New York: Clergy and  
Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, 1968.
- McSorley, Richard. Kill for Peace? New York: Cypress, 1970.
- Moffatt, James. The General Epistles James, Peter, and Judas.  
New York: Harper & Row, 1928.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. Theology of Hope. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Religion, Revolution, and the Future. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.
- Morris, Colin. Unyoung - Uncolored - Unpoor. New York: Abingdon Press, 1969.
- Osgood, Charles E. An Alternative to War or Surrender. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1962.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart (ed.) Revelation as History. New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Theology and the Kingdom of God. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. What is Man? Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.
- Peterson, H. C., and Gilbert C. Fite. Opponents of War, 1917-1918. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1957.
- Potter, Ralph B. War and Moral Discourse. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1969.
- Ramsey, Paul. War and the Christian Conscience. How Shall Modern War Be Conducted Justly? Durham: Duke University Press, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Just War. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.
- Rothenberg, Leslie S. The Draft and You, a Handbook on the Selective Service System. Garden City: Doubleday, 1968.
- Schlissel, Lillian (ed.) Conscience in America, a Documentary History in America, 1757-1967. New York: Dutton, 1968.
- Seifert, Harvey. Conquest by Suffering, The Process and Prospects of Nonviolent Resistance. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.
- Sellers, James. Theological Ethics. New York: Macmillan, 1966.
- Sibley, Milford Q. The Obligation to Disobey, Conscience and the Law. New York: Council on Religion and International Affairs, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. , and Philip E. Jacob. Conscription of Conscience, the American State and the Conscientious Objector, 1940-1947. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1952.
- Swomley, John M., Jr. American Empire, The Political Ethics of Twentieth-Century Conquest. New York: Macmillan, 1970.
- Taylor, Telford. Nuremberg and Vietnam: An American Tragedy. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1970.

Tatum, Arlo. Handbook for Conscientious Objectors. 11th. ed.  
Philadelphia: PDQ, 1970.

Tooke, Joan D. The Just War in Aquinas and Grotius. London:  
S.P.C.K., 1965.

Vesey, Laurence (ed.) Law and Resistance. American Attitudes Toward  
Authority. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Wall, Byron (ed.) Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada. 5th. ed.  
Toronto: House of Anasi, 1970.

Wells, Donald A. The War Myth. New York: Pegasus, 1967.

Wittels, Mike. Advice for Conscientious Objectors in the Armed  
Forces. Berkley, Ca.: Berkley Graphic Arts, 1970.

Woodstone, Norma Sue. Up Against the War, a Personal Introduction  
to U. S. Soldiers and Civilians Fighting Against the War in  
Vietnam. New York: Tower, 1970.

Zahn, Gordon C. An Alternative to War. New York: Council on  
Religion and International Affairs, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. War, Conscience and Dissent. New York: Hawthorn, 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_. In Solitary Witness. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Military Chaplaincy, a Study of Role Tension in the  
Royal Air Force. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Zimmer, Timothy W. L. Letters of C. O. From Prison. Valley Forge,  
Pa.: Judson Press, 1969.

Zinn, Howard. Disobedience and Democracy, Nine Fallacies on Law and  
Order. New York: Vintage, 1968.

## B. PERIODICALS

Bourg, Carroll J. "Father Berrigan Jester of the Underground." Engage, III (October 1, 1970), 15-18.

Calvert, Bob. "War Tax Resistance." Win, VI (November 1, 1970), 22-23.

Cohn, Fred. "Making a Peoples Army." Win, VI (December 1, 1970), 4-8.

Council for Christian Social Action. "Amnesty for War Objectors." Social Action, XXXV (April 1969), 6-9.

Driver, Tom F. "Thinking is Doing." Christianity and Crisis, XXIX (February 17, 1969), 20-23.

Feinberg, Rabbi Abraham L. "Vietnam and Civil Disobedience." Fellowship, XXXIII (May 1967), 4.

Forsyth, Charles H. "A Canadian Perspective." Social Action, XXXVI (March 1970), 14-16.

Gibbons, Paul E. "What About the Resistance?" Social Action, XXXV (January 1969), 31-48.

Killmer, Richard Lee. "A Call From Macedonia." Social Action, XXXVI (March 1970), 5-11.

Klemme, Huber F. "The New Exodus." Social Action, XXXVI (March 1970), 3-4.

Leonetti, Dianne. "For the Men Who Risk Everything Opposing the Military From Within...Peace Groups Call for a General Amnesty." Fellowship, XXXV (March 1969), 10-12.

Loder, Theodore W. "A Genuine Surprise to Us All." Engage, III (September 15, 1970), 9-10.

Lundholm, Michael E. "I Chose Canada." Social Action, XXXVI (March 1970), 12-13.

McDonald, Donald. "Militarism In America." Center Magazine, III (January 1970), 13-14.

Peters, David. "Dissent on Amnesty." Social Action, XXXV (April 1969), 9-10.

Potts, Albert W. Jr. "Symbolic Acts and Civil Disobedience." Christian Advocate, XIII (November 27, 1968), 9-10.

Siegel, Arlene. "12 Days of Sanctuary at MIT." Resist Newsletter, XX (December 2, 1968)

"23 Arrested at Arsenal." War Resisters League (July, August 1970)

Wingate, Jerry. "Military Mind and Private Joe Malarkey." Win, VI (December 1, 1970), 9-11.

Yolton, L. William. "U. S. Churches Face a Pastoral Task." Social Action, XXXVI (March 1970), 20-26.

### C. OTHER MATERIAL

"Behind Bars. A Prison Anthology." Chicago Area Draft Resisters, 519 W. North Ave., Chicago, Ill. December 5, 1968. (Mimeographed)

Brick, Allan. "Report on the Catonsville Nine - What is Nonviolence Today?" (Mimeographed)

"Conscience and Conscription." A Statement by Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam. (Mimeographed)

"Deserters in Exile." Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, 475 Riverside Drive, New York. October 1968 (Mimeographed)

Duggan, John E. "A Letter of Non-cooperation." September 6, 1967 (Mimeographed)

Funk, Robert. "Magic Beyond Truth." Paper read at Second Annual Colwell Lecture, Claremont, California, February 11, 1971.

Kunkle, Howard R. "The Primitive Church and War." New York: Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Los Angeles Times (August 16, 1970)

New York Times Magazine (May 18, 1969)

## **APPENDIXES**

## APPENDIX A

### THE CATONSVILLE STATEMENT

"Today, May 17, 1968, we enter Local Board No. 33 at Catonsville, Md., to seize the Selective Service records and burn them outside with napalm manufactured by ourselves from a recipe in the Special Forces Handbook, published by the US government.

We, American citizens, have worked with the poor in the ghetto and abroad. In the course of our Christian ministry we have watched our country produce more victims than an army of us could console or restore. Two of us face immediate sentencing for similar acts against Selective Service. All of us identify with the victims of American oppression all over the world. We submit voluntarily to their involuntary fate.

#### napalm and the draft

We use napalm on these draft records because napalm has burned people to death in Vietnam, Guatemala and Peru; and because it may be used on America's ghettos. We destroy these draft records not only because they represent misplaced power, concentrated in the ruling class of America. Their power threatens the peace of the world and is aloof from public dissent and parliamentary process. The draft reduces young men to cost efficiency items. The rulers of America want their global wars fought as cheaply as possible.

Above all, our protest attempts to illustrate why our country is torn at home and is harrassed abroad by enemies of its own creation. America has become an empire and history's richest nation. Representing only 6 per cent of the world's people, America controls half of the world's productive wealth and 60 per cent of its finance. The US holds North and South America in an economic vise. In 10 years' time American industry in Europe will be the third greatest industrial power in the world, with only the United States and the Soviet Union being larger. US foreign profits run substantially higher than domestic profits so industry flees abroad under government patronage and the protection of the CIA, military counter insurgency and conflict-management teams.

#### triumverate of power

The military supports the economic system by joining with the business and political sectors to form the triumverate of power in this technocratic empire. With our annual budget of \$80 billion plus, the military now controls over half of the federal property in the world



(53 per cent of \$183 billion). US overkill capacity and conventional weaponry exceeds that of the military might of the entire world.

Peace negotiations with the North Vietnamese have begun in Paris. Along with other Americans we hope a settlement will be reached, thus sparing the Vietnamese a useless prolongation of their suffering. However this alone will not solve America's problems. The Vietnam war could end tomorrow and yet the quality of society and America's role in the world virtually unchanged. Thailand, Laos and the Dominican Republic have already been Vietnams. Guatemala, the Canal Zone, Bolivia and Peru could be Vietnams overnight. Meanwhile, the colonies at home rise in rage and destructiveness. The black people of America have concluded that after 360 years, their acceptance as human beings is long overdue.

Injustice is the great catalyst of revolution. A nation that found life through revolution has now become the world's number one counter-revolutionary force, not because American people would have it that way, but because the rich choose to defend their power and wealth. The masters of the trusts and corporate giants, along with their representatives in Washington, must learn the hard lessons of justice, or our country may be swept away and humanity with it.

We believe some property has no right to exist. Hitler's gas ovens, Stalin's concentration camps, atomic-bacteriological-chemical weaponry, files of conscription and slum properties are examples having no right to existence. While people starve for bread and lack decent housing the rich debase themselves with comfort paid for by the misery of the poor.

We are Catholic Christians who take the Gospel of our Faith seriously. We hail the recent papal encyclical, The Development of Peoples.

23: "No one is justified in keeping for his exclusive use what he does not need, when others lack necessities."

31: "A revolutionary uprising - save where there is open manifest and long standing tyranny which does great damage to fundamental personal rights and dangerous harm to the common good of the country - produces new injustices, throws more elements out of balance and brings on new disasters."

development demands innovation

32: "We want to be clearly understood: the present situation must be faced with courage, and the injustices linked with it must be fought against and overcome. Development demands bold transformations, innovations that go deep. Urgent reforms should be undertaken without delay. It is for each one to take his share in them with generosity, particularly those whose education, position and opportunities afford them wide scope of action."

47: "It is a question of building a world where every man, no matter what his race, religion or nationality, can live a fully human life, freed from slavery imposed on him by other men or by natural forces; a world where the poor man Lazarus can sit down at the same

table with the rich man."

80: "The hour for action has now sounded. At stake are the survival of so many innocent children and for so many families overcome by misery, the access to conditions fit for human beings: at stake are the peace of the world and the future of civilization."

we confront the churches

At the same time, we confront the Catholic Church, other Christian bodies and the synagogues of America with their silence and cowardice in face of our country's crimes. We are convinced that the religious bureaucracy in this country is racist, is an accomplice in war and is hostile to the poor. In utter fidelity to our faith, we indict the religious leaders and their followers for their failure to serve our country and mankind.

Finally, we are appalled by the use of the American ruling class invoking the cry for "Law and Order" to mask and perpetuate injustice. Let our President and the pillars of society speak of "Law and Justice," and back up their words with deeds and there will be "Order." We have pleaded, spoken, marched and nursed the victims of their injustice. Now this injustice must be faced, and this we intend to do, with whatever strength of mind, body and grace that God will give us. May God have mercy on our nation.

FR. DANIEL BERRIGAN, S.J., FR. PHILIP BERRIGAN, S.J., DAVID DARST, JOHN HOGAN, THOMAS LEWIS, MARJORIE MELVILLE, THOMAS MELVILLE, GEORGE MISCHÉ, MARY MOYLAN

## APPENDIX B

### THE MILWAUKEE STATEMENT

"Generation after generation religious values have summoned man to undertake the works of mercy and peace. In times of crisis these values have further required men to cry out in protest against institutions and systems destructive of man and his immense potential.

We declare today that we are one with that history of mercy and protest. In destroying with napalm part of our nation's bureaucratic machinery of conscription we declare that the service of life no longer provides any options other than positive, concrete action against what can only be called the American way of death: a way of death which gives property a greater value than life, a way of death sustained not by invitation and hope but by coercion and fear.

We confess we were not easily awakened to the need for such action as we carry out today. In order for communities of resistance to come into being, millions had to die at America's hands, while in the process millions of America's sons were torn from family, friends, health, sanity and often life itself. Victim and executioner have been trapped in the same dragnet of death.

#### roots of the Vietnamese struggle

We have had to trace the roots of the Vietnamese struggle and suffering and admit that all too many of those roots converge in the soil of American values and priorities.

And we have had to adjust to the discovery that in that same soil have been engendered many of the other tragedies already under way. At home and abroad, opponents of America's economic, political and military commitments share with the innocent death by over violence and the gunless violence of the status quo: death by starvation and malnutrition, death from despair, death from overwork and exhaustion and disease. America, in the meantime, celebrates its "way of life": the canonization of competition and self interest, a high standard of living which rests on the backs of the poor. The values of brotherhood, joy, liberation and love become less and less comprehensible to our society. The world's wealthiest, most heavily-armed people, inheritors of a nation born in genocide against the Indians and built in great measure upon the toils of slaves, suffocate beneath myths of freedom and popular political control. Leaders of the religious establishment - preoccupied with mortgage payments, film-ratings, pills - automatically conscript the Creator of life into the ranks of America's high command, leaving others to apply the prophetic message they ritually recite. Vietnamese burn, Biafrans starve, tanks dominate the streets of Prague: at home Americans buy diet colas and flesh (that is, caucasian) colored band-aids, see dissenters clubbed to

the streets, counsel the poor to patience, cry for law and order...

The tragedy worsens. While the number of American casualties in Vietnam has doubled during the past year, and the number of bombing raids nearly tripled since the President's "de-escalation" announcement of March 31, the very fact of US discussions with the North Vietnamese has convinced many previously dissident Americans that their government now desires a peaceful settlement. The presence of American soldiers in antirevolutionary struggles elsewhere in the world goes unobserved.

For a growing number of us, the problem is no longer that of grasping what is happening. We know it by heart. Ours is rather a problem of courage. We wish to offer our lives and future to blockade, absorb and transform the violence and madness which our society has come to personify.

#### a movement of resistance to slavery

We who burn these records of our society's war machine are participants in a movement of resistance to slavery, a struggle that remains as unresolved in America as in most of the world. Man remains an object to be rewarded insofar as he is obedient and useful, to be punished when he dares declare his liberation.

Our action concentrates on the Selective Service System because its relation to murder is immediate. Men are drafted - or "volunteer" for fear of being drafted - as killers for the state. Their victims litter the planet. In Vietnam alone, where nearly 30,000 Americans have died, no one can count the Vietnamese dead, crippled, the mentally maimed.

Today we destroy Selective Service System files because men need to be reminded that property is not sacred. Property belongs to the human scene only if man does. If anything tangible is sacred, it is the gift of life and flesh, flesh which is daily burned, made homeless, butchered - without tears or clamour from most Americans - in Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Peru, Guatemala, Bolivia, Columbia, Nigeria, South Africa, Harlem, Delano, Watts, and wherever the poor live and die, forgotten people, the anonymous majority. So property is repeatedly made enemy of life; gas ovens in Germany, concentration camps in Russia, occupation tanks in Czechoslovakia, pieces of paper in draft offices, slum holdings, factories of death machines, germs and nerve gas. Indeed our nation has seen, with such isolated exceptions as the Boston Tea Party, devotion to property take ever greater precedence over devotion to life. So we today, in the face of such a history, proclaim that property has sanction only insofar as it serves man's need and the common good.

#### America's marriage to coercion

We strike at the Selective Service System because the draft, and

the vocational channelling connected with it, are the clearest examples at hand of America's marriage to coercive political methods, exercised within as without its borders. In destroying these links in the military chain of command, we forge anew the good sense of the Second Vatican Council: "Man's dignity demands that he act according to a free conscience that is personally motivated from within, not under mere external pressure or blind internal impulse." (Constitution on the Church in the Modern World).

We use napalm because it has come to symbolize the American way of death: a merciless substance insensitive to life and the sound of the human heart, blind to human pain, ignorant of guilt and innocence. Indeed napalm is the inevitable fruit of our national un-conscience, the sign of our numbness to life.

Finally, we use napalm and strike at the draft as a point of continuity in the nonviolent struggle recently carried forward in Maryland. There last November four resisters, using their own blood, stained the Baltimore draft records. And again, last May, a community of nine burned the 1-A files in Catonsville. At that time they declared, as we declare today, "Some property has no right to exist."

We have no illusions regarding the consequences of our action. To make visible another community of resistance and to better explain our action, we have chosen to act publicly and to accept the consequences. But we pay the price, if not gladly, at least with a profound hope. Just as our own hearts have spoken to us, just as we - not long ago strangers to one another - have been welded into community and delivered into resistance, so do we see the same spirit of hope and courage, the same freedom pouring into others: joy surprisingly is made possible only in the laying aside of plans for a comfortable private future.

Our action is not an end in itself. We invite those who are ready to lay aside fear and economic addictions in order to join in the struggle: to confront injustice in words and deeds, to build a community worthy of men made in the image and likeness of God...a society in which it is easier for men to be human.

DON COTTON, MICHAEL CULLEN, FR. ROBERT CUNNANE, JAMES FOREST, JERRY GARDNER, BOB GRAF, REV. JON HIGGENBOTHAM, FR. JAMES HARNEY, FR. ALFRED JANICKE, DOUG MARVY, FR. ANTHONY MULLANEY, FRED J. OJILE, BRO. K. BASH O'LEARY, FR. LARRY ROSEBAUGH

## APPENDIX C

### I CHOSE CANADA

On the 26th of June 1969 I deserted from the United States Army and subsequently began a new life in Canada. The purpose of this statement is to document the reasons for this act and certain experiences prior to it.

Prior to being drafted I was an architect qualified to practice in Pennsylvania. I designed and supervised construction of a medical auditorium and parking garage, both now complete. I was deeply involved in urban planning work with a Philadelphia planning office. I received public praise from Dr. Mark Shedd, Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia, for a research project on ghetto education, and received two design awards from Drexel Institute of Technology. I say all of this only to combat the public image of a deserter as one who is a misfit and unable to adjust to modern society. The times have changed; and rational, intelligent people are doing what was previously "unthinkable" after being forced into a choice between few morally acceptable alternatives. In the military itself I was able to cope with many brutal, dehumanizing situations. I was sent to an Army NCO training program in which I was named "Honor Graduate" and promoted to the rank of Staff Sergeant. In my case as with many others I have met, the idea of a deserter as one who is unable to accept discipline and the rigors of military life is not true, though I certainly do not believe that any human being should be forced to undergo such treatment.

The whole period of time that I spent in the military was a time of conflict within myself, a time of sorting out of values, and a time of determining what I really was. Even before being drafted I had firm beliefs that the Vietnam War was not morally justified regardless of the merits (if any) of the stated goals of the United States. I found no justification sufficiently valid to support the destruction of a people through war. The reasons for my conflict were rather concerned with the role and responsibilities of an individual when ordered by his country to commit acts which to him are morally unacceptable. Towards the end of this period I knew that the ultimate responsibility for one's actions does indeed lie with the individual, and that social forces must be secondary to this. I was left with two choices: refusing orders to Vietnam with a resultant period in military prison, and desertion to a foreign country. Both alternatives were extremely difficult to contemplate. The final decision to come to Canada was based on the grounds that this period of my life should be constructive rather than wasted. Since coming I have become a counselor to new arrivals for a Canadian counseling group and believe that this usefulness is far more valuable than the unnoticed act of martyrdom implied by choosing prison.

Prior to leaving I felt that I should try all legal opportunities open to me, however futile. For the first time I realized that I

was a conscientious objector in the legal sense of that term. I made application for this status in Oakland, California. Army regulations provide seven days for preparation of the application. On the fifth or sixth day (depending on interpretation), while I was typing the final draft, I was placed under guard with the intention of being shipped to Vietnam. The officers in charge refused to accept the application. A writ was obtained from Federal Court in San Francisco by my lawyer and was effectively served on the Post Commander preventing my shipment. My application was subsequently received, expedited to Washington and back, denied, in three days. The reason given for denial was that my objection was based on "a personal moral code and not sincere religious training and belief." That these events did in fact occur can be verified with my lawyer, Mr. Steven Arian, 345 Franklin Street, San Francisco, and in the records of the Federal Court.

As a counselor I have talked to many of the new refugees from the United States. Their reasons for coming are many and varied: opposition to the very idea of a draft system, escape from exceptional brutality in the military, refusal to participate in the Vietnam War. The common factor is that they are individuals reacting to a situation sufficiently intolerable to make them forfeit their rights to life in the country of their birth. Few are politically motivated. The overall picture becomes a sad statement of what America is offering its young people. I personally feel little bitterness; only a profound grief that this is what has happened to the country that I loved.

MICHAEL E. LUNDHOLM

APPENDIX D

A LETTER OF NONCOOPERATION

1624 Washington Street  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
September 6, 1967

Local Board # 66  
Selective Service System  
2355 West 63rd Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60636

Dear Sirs:

On August 25, 1967, you gentlemen mailed me a Selective Service System "Order to Report to Induction." This induction has been scheduled for me at 615 West Van Buren Street - Chicago, Illinois - 4th floor, on September 20, 1967, at 6:30 A.M.

In short I would like to inform you that I will not attend that induction; neither will I participate in an induction in Denver, Colorado or elsewhere.

Considering sir, that all men are one and that we are here to witness to that and to live and to create with that central fact always before us; considering sir, that our country's foreign policy--as so clearly laid bare in our immoral, illegal, genocidal war on Vietnam--is neither loving, human nor even remotely beneficial to mankind; considering sir, that America, which is only about one-sixth of the world's population, controls over one-half of the world's goods and still has an estimated thirty-two million persons in poverty; considering sir, that America appropriates over half of her annual budget for military defense "needs" while over half of the world's people do not have adequate food, housing, medicine and other essentials; having considered these points and many, many others sir, I can not accept induction into the world's leading military establishment.

The American military establishment as it exists today on over half of our national budget deprives money, technology, initiative, creativity and supplies which should rightly go to the poor and underdeveloped peoples of the world. The American military as it exists today on over half of our national budget automatically defeats any realistic approach to our domestic poverty by simple virtue of the fact that even in the richest of nations there is a limit to our resources. The American military today will be the principle tool of reaction as white, Christian, Westerners attempt to maintain domestic and international privilege in the face of revolts--violent and nonviolent--by poor, oppressed people attempting for the first time in centuries to



control their own political, cultural and economic destinies.  
Witness: Vietnam, Dominican Republic, Congo, Guatamaula, Peru,  
Bolivia, Cuba....

If you gentlemen would like I will be happy to meet with Selective Service to discuss these matters in the event that further information or clarification is desired. I can not now come to Chicago, but of course there is a Selective Service office in Denver. I will probably be back in Chicago around Thanksgiving, during which time I will gladly meet with you if that is so desired. In the meantime I am living here in Colorado, and have been for one year now, for health reasons. I need dry climate.

I sincerely hope that none of you gentlemen will interpret my total opposition to Selective Service and the American military establishment of which it is an integral part as an action against any of you as individual persons. I am sure you are all faithful, hard working employees of a System which you believe to be basically just in its pursuit of basic human needs in society today. I, of course, challenge some of your basic assumptions (I can only think how you must challenge some of mine!) in coming to beliefs which enable you to work for Selective Service in the face of the ever increasing evidence against the Administration's war on Vietnam. But I would definitely like to stress that none of my opposition is aimed at any of you personally; further, I wish you all the best. I wish you that sincerely.

With best regards from Denver,

(signed)

John E. Duggan

## APPENDIX E

### CONCERNED OFFICERS' MOVEMENT

The concerned Officers's Movement was formed in November 1969 by a group of active duty and reserve officers who could no longer continue to be passive, unquestioning agents of military and national policies they found untenable. Realizing that silence implies consent and cooperation, the members of COM are resolved to speak out on issues that concern them as officers and American citizens.

Paramount in the program of COM is a fervent opposition to the continuing military effort in Vietnam. COM decries the military policies that turned an internal political struggle into a nation-destroying blood-bath. The application of American military power in Vietnam was as unnecessary as it was unworkable. There is no need to prolong the mistake. COM supports a ceasefire and the rapid disengagement of American troops from Southeast Asia.

COM further abhors the military mentality that promotes absurd measures like the body count; that leads to the indiscriminate slaughter of innocent civilians; that destroys land and villages and calls it victory.

COM is opposed to the preponderant share of national resources devoted to the military. While Americans go hungry, while cities decay, while our natural resources become more despoiled, the Pentagon is able to get billions of dollars for an ABM system that may not even work. National defense is important, but so are poverty, education, and the environment. It is time to re-examine our priorities.

Within the military structure itself, COM supports the free expression of dissenting opinion. GI movements with legitimate grievances have too long been suppressed by a military hierarchy that considers honest questioning a threat to its power. The military can no longer consider itself a closed, private sector of society; the constitutional rights of free speech must be guaranteed for all servicemen.

COM advocates a full airing of questions concerning the quality of life in the military. There are many points that should be considered, from haircut regulations to enlisted-officer class differentiation, from low pay to the harassment of new recruits. COM does not question the need for discipline within the military, rather it seeks out areas that can be improved to make military order more humane and reasonable. The worsening problem of low retention rates in the service proves that something is wrong. A full inquiry into all aspects of military regulations and customs should not be avoided.

The members of the Concerned Officers' Movement are loyal, responsible

military officers. Many have served in Vietnam, an experience that forced them into the realization that unquestioning acceptance of national and military goals could only further war and injustice.

Officers, as part of the military power structure and as enforcers of military policies, have an obligation to express themselves on some of these important issues. The members of COM refuse to be classified as part of a manipulated "Silent Majority;" they will speak out. To do less would be to betray their commissions and duties as American citizens.

Washington, D.C.

May, 1970

116693

THEOLOGY LIBRARY  
CLAREMONT, CALIF.